National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment---Without Compromise. | EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. X.---NO. 49. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1850. | WHOLE NUMBER 517.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS,
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

NORRIS BROTHERS, PRINTERS.

Selections.

We referred a week or two ago to some strictures of the *Journal of Commerce* on Anti-Slavery preaching, and copy now a further article from that paper on the same subject. It is a new thing under the sun that the pro-slavery party feels itself the aggrieved one for the course of the pulpit in this matter, and even the novelty of the thing, if nothing else, would prompt us to give such people a hearing.—The *Journal*, however, may be assured that a herculean task is laid out for it in an attempt to stem a tide that is just turning and must run to its full flood. That it shall overflow David Hale at the outset is as inevitable as that all things must be covered or floated that are set at low-water mark.

POLITICS AND THE PULPIT.

Our recent article on this subject has produced the effect which we intended. It has turned public attention to the duties of clergymen, as such, in relation to current political questions. The numerous expressions of thanks which, in one form or another, we have received for that article, both from clergymen and laymen, convince us that it was timely and appropriate. The same inference we deduce from the effervesence which it has occasioned in certain quarters where its admonitions were most needed. *The Independent* is particlarly sensitive on the subject, and devotes four mortal columns to a reply. We are afraid that the congregations of some of its editors heard old sermons last Sabbath, but they may have been good ones, notwithstanding.

As *The Independent* failed to reach us last week, we had no opportunity to read it until yesterday, though we suppose we might have had, if we had taken the trouble to send to the office for a copy.

We are surprised at the degree of heat which the gentlemen manifest, as if the object of our article were personal to themselves or their paper: whereas, the worst thing we wish them is, that they may have wisdom to fulfil their multifarious and responsible duties in a manner which shall leave them no just cause of regret, and their readers and hearers no just ground of complaint. As to *The Independent*, we have always wished that it might be so conducted as to deserve success. We wish so still.

There are several points in the reply of *The Independent* which invite remark, but for the present we can only notice that part of it which relates to Dr. Lansing. Says *The Independent*,—

"The following is the language used by Dr. L. as given by himself according to the best of his recollection: 'On the great question of human rights, now under dicussion at Washington, there is an evident leaning toward the doctrine of mere expediency. I do not call in question the honesty of Mr. Clay's intentions, in the Bill of Compromise which he has proposed. I wish I could say as much of Mr. Webster, the sentiments of whose recent speech in the Senate have disappointed the expectations of his friends. As to Senator Foote, he has acted the part of a fool, and belongs not to the class of mind with whose views he sympathizes. I thank God that we find in one Senator, the Hon. W. H. Seward, a man who will not truckle to the doctrine of worldly expediency, but feels himself under obligation to a law above the Constitution when in his conscientious convictions the Constitution comes into competition with the supreme law of eternal and unchangeable right; and that he sustained his position with great dignity and consistency, notwithstanding Mr. Cass's inquiry, what he would do with his conscience in the light of his oath to sustain the Constitution.'"

In connexion with the statement from Dr. Lansing, we insert the following communication from the gentlemen who furnished us the outline of his remarks.

(For the Journal of Commerce)

"As the *Independent* has seen fit to contradict and censure the 'reporter' of certain remarks of a venerable clergyman of Brooklyn, the aforesaid 'reporter' avails himself of this opportunity to say a word or two on his own behalf:

"*To the Editors of the Independent*:—Gentlemen;—I am a friend and parishioner of Dr Lansing, and I believe him to be my friend. I have not, and never had any reason, motive, or inducement, for any feeling of animosity toward him; and I greatly regret that circumstances have placed me in a position of seeming antagonism to him. The more than ordinary esteem which I entertain for my reverend friend, who for more than forty years has been one of the most conspicous stars in the theological firmament, and who is deliberately wronged by being stigmatized in the *Independent* as the occupant of an obscure position, is my only excuse for condescending to notice the extremely courteous article of the *Independent*.

"As for the 'remarks' which have given rise to this discussion, they are merely a cluster of sentences of an extraordinary character, both in regard to time and place, and were remembered chiefly on that account; and although only a portion of what was spoken, yet the 'remarks' with which they were connected, either had no reference whatever to them, or did not modify their import, alter their sense, or make them more intelligible; in short, what was offered as a qualification, only served to confuse the statement,—so much so that the good sense of the speaker prompted him to make an abrupt termination.

"Although the 'knowing ones' thought Mr. Beecher and Dr. Cox both capable of uttering the remarks in question, and both were honored by being suspected and examined, yet the *Independent* is 'amazed at the meanness of the *Journal* in dragging before the public' an individual whom the aforesaid *Independent* takes particular pains to make unworthy of consideration or notice, and unknown except to a 'little circle of two hundred hearers,' in a Conference Room in the suburbs of Brooklyn.' This is a strange undertaking truly, to look for 'motes' with the vision obstructed by such a 'beam.' These sneers at the sphere of usefulness of one of the oldest and most widely known clergymen of his denomination, certainly do not come with a good grace from the editors of the *Independent*, several of whom claim to be his personal friends. If they are not tinctured with malignity, they are, to say the least, exceedingly reprehensible, and ought to be avoided as having the appearance of evil.

"It cannot be denied that the Clinton Avenue congregation cherish a sincere attachment to their pastor, and are wont to take for law and Gospel whatever he may utter; and it is doubtless owing to this strong personal regard, that the attempt has been made to modify the extraordinary character of his statement, because it did not appear as well in print as it sounded from the pulpit. I half suspect that certain well meaning members of the flock have been assisting their pastor in endeavoring to remember what he did say. Especially, the 'Foote' interposed between 'Mr. Webster' and 'the part of a fool,' appears to me entirely gratuitous. I believe the reverend gentleman to be a man of honor, and one who would not deny or falsify his statement, knowingly, to evade any responsibility; yet I know that it is a difficult matter for a public speaker to recollect his extemporaneous remarks, and I fear that the suggestions of friends may have been adopted in lieu of remembered words. Certain it is that the Dr.'s memory is at fault in relating the 'different affair,' which is 'substantially, though not in the language of the informant of the *Journal*,' the upshot of what he really said. But this note is already too long. As has been before stated, my report was properly verified by competent testimony before it was printed, and in order to satisfy my friends, as well as the gentlemen I am charged with misrepresenting, of my ability to repeat what I hear, I will conclude by quoting 'substantially' a passage of his *sermon* of the same day, which I especially commend to the studious consideration of the editors of the *Independent*:"

"Do right! Shall I tell you that angel-guards are about you? This is folly. The GOD of angel-guards himself protects you. But if you do wrong, the whole host of heaven forsakes you, and hell with all its malignity encircles you about to urge you on to the lowest depths of damnation."

"REPORTER."

"Brooklyn, April 20, 1850.

It was with reluctance we mentioned the name of Dr. Lansing, because, in common with our informant, we entertain for him a very high respect, and were loth to subject him to the slightest inconvenience. But the reasonable demand of other clergymen of Brooklyn made the announcement unavoidable. 'We quoted his remarks for a public, and as we deemed it, an important object; and if necessary, we shall quote remarks of some other clergymen which are equally adapted to our purpose, and equally if not more objectionable. As to the 'meanness' of quoting such remarks, we are willing the *Independent* should entertain its own opinion. But we wish clergymen to understand, that if they bring politics into their pulpits, and especially if they resort to gross personalties, decrying the conduct and impeaching the motives of eminent statesmen, whom we believe to have acted with a sincere regard to the public welfare, and in opposition to their personal preferences and interests, we shall consider such remarks as belonging to the public, and govern ourselves accordingly. What is said publicly to a congregation, is said to the world. Reporters have a right to report it, and publishers to print it. They will do so at their pleasure.

We will quote one more paragraph from the *Independent*, just to show the uncomfortable mood of the editor who penned it. He says:—

"We had not before realized how much of the nobleness, and candor, and liberality of the *Journal of Commerce* died with its senior editor. Who would have believed that a journal established by the energy and business tact of David Hale, and sustained by his talents and reputation, could have become so prostituted as to abuse his personal friends, to cast foul dishonor upon prayer, and preaching, and the institutions of religion, to stigmatize a respectable and useful class of citizens for the color of their coats, to proscribe them from the common rights of opinion and of speech, to appeal to the selfish interests of men to deprive them of their places and support, and even to stir up the passions of the mob to 'roll their black coats in the dirt!' But alas, a wise and good man dies, 'and who can tell what shall be after him under the sun?'"

We suppose the Rev. gentleman thinks we shall be greatly mortified to see the whole credit of establishing and sustaining the *Journal of Commerce* attributed to our late partner, but in this he is mistaken. No man, while living, was more abused by the Abolitionists than David Hale; and if, now that he is dead, they or those who sympathize with them, see fit to garnish his sepulchre, we shall be the last to complain. We do not say that the editors of the *Independent* abused him; some of them were recipients of his bounty, and men, it is said, will not quarrel with their bread and butter. But precisely the same charge of *no conscience* was brought against him by others, for precisely the same views on the subject of Abolition and its kindred topics, which the *Independent* now brings against those who entertain similar opinions. Even *since* the death of Mr. Hale, one writer repeats the slander. In reviewing Rev. Mr. Thompson's 'Life and Writings of David Hale,' the last number of the New Englander, published at New Haven, says:—

"The collection and publication of Mr. Hale's articles on 'Colonization and Abolition' prove the impartiality of the compiler, but reflect no honor upon Mr. Hale. We ought to expect, however, those who advocate and defend, in a truly philanthropic spirit, the wise and benevolent plan of African Colonization—a plan which has been brought (by whose fault we do not say) into an unnecessary and unnatural conflict with Anti-Slavery and Abolitionism. But those which treat of Anti Slavery, of its men and measures, we cannot approve but feel bound to censure. Indeed, how a man who loved justice and human freedom as Mr. Hale did, could have had so little sympathy with the opposers of Slavery and the advocates of emancipation; how a man who was so strenuous and uncompromising an advocate of free discussion as he was, could have frowned and sneered as he did at the discussion of the subject of emancipation, and at liberty of speech in the American Board respecting its relations to Slavery, we do not understand. *We must insist that his heart was not right on that subject.*"

We have italicised the last sentence, as expressing the sentiment of which we complain; a sentiment which is common, if not universal, among the heated opponents of Slavery. Any man who cannot agree with them on that subject, is morally blind. It is not enough to say that he is mistaken; that he errs in judgment, and the like; but they will have it that his *heart* is wrong—his *moral sense* stupified—his *conscience* seared. Now, this is what we call bigotry; certainly it is not charity.

When the *Independent* charges us with 'casting foul dishonor upon prayer and preaching,' the most charitable construction which we can put upon its language, is to suppose that the editor, at the moment of writing it, was a little bewildered by passion. The only connexion in which we have used either expression, to the best of our knowledge and belief, is when we said that "many clergymen at this day preach Free Soilism and pray Free Soilism.' And saying this is 'casting foul dishonor upon prayer and preaching!' is it? In our opinion *they* cast a much fouler dishonor upon both, who thus abuse and pervert them. The remainder of the *Independent's* paragraph above quoted, is of the same order. It is a mere caricature, with scarcely sufficient verisimilitude to identify it with the original.

We annex brief extracts from four communications which we have received on this general subject:

(For the Journal of Commerce)

"Mr. Editor:—One of your readers is much pleased with your editorial to-day respecting 'Politics and the Pulpit.' Its spirit is good, and the sentiments are just. The castigation of a certain '*Independent*' paper, well put and justly merited.

"The fame of Mr. Webster will live when his vilifiers are forgotten. There is too much of a spirit among us that would condemn everything, and everybody that does not come up to *its standard*. Who hears of disunion since the delivery of Mr. Webster's late speech? "CIVIS."

New York, April 12, 1850.

(For the Journal of Commerce.)

"Mr. Editor:—The thanks of the whole reasonable public are due for your leading article on the indecent and unchristian interference of some of the clergy in the political bearing of the Slavery question. * * * * * PILGRIM."

(For the Journal of Commerce.)

"I beg leave, Mr. Editor, to tender you my heartfelt thanks for the timely and pertinent remarks under the head of 'Politics and the Pulpit,' contained in your paper of Friday last. As the son of a clergyman I thank you. As a sincere, and as I trust, not altogether an unenlightened believer in the truths of the Gospel, I thank you. As a lover of freedom, a friend of humanity, and withal a law-abiding citizen, I thank you. I depart not from the truth in declaring it to be my irresistible conviction that more than twice 'ten thousand pulpits' stand ready to endorse every sentence in the editorial article to which I refer. I read with unfeigned sorrow your quotations from a pulpit in a neighboring city, and from a portion of the so-called religious press of our own city. Never did men more truly deserve rebuke than did those to whom you so faithfully and forcibly administered it. * * * * *

"A NEW ENGLANDER."

(For the Journal of Commerce.)

"Mr. Editor:—In common with many others, I have read with no little interest a leading article in the *Journal of Commerce* published a few days since, headed 'Politics and the Pulpit.'

"Your remarks have appeared to me just and proper, published at a time when they were greatly needed, and I believe they have been well received and highly appreciated by many, probably by most of your readers.

"When those who profess to be ministers of the Gospel, whose duty it is to preach Christ crucified to a lost and dying world,—whose great aim and purpose should be to win souls for Heaven—so far forget their high and sacred calling, and the duties they owe to their Lord and Master, as to desecrate not only the *pulpit* but the *Sabbath*, by abolition harrangues, it is time they should be reminded to return to their duty. If some of our religious papers are silent, and others tacitly and openly encourage this departure from the plain path of duty, it is desirable that secular papers should speak out; and you, Mr. Editor, have the thanks of thousands for the admonition you have given. As you very justly remark, 'peaceable, quiet men of more congregations than one, are becoming much dissatisfied with the course of their pastors in regard to the Slavery question. * * * *

"LAYMAN."

We copy from the *Evening Post* another of the excellent letters of its West India Correspondent:

LETTERS FROM JAMAICA.

Kingston, February 1, 1850.

In my last letter, I alluded briefly to a fact in connexion with the industrial history of Jamaica, which surprised me very much when I learned it, and of which, so far as I know, no public notice has ever been taken. I refer to the utterly insolvent condition of the proprietors previous to the emancipation of the blacks. The whole business of the island, even then, was done upon credit, given, as I suggested, upon the most ruinous terms. The emancipation act precipitated a result which was inevitable—it compelled a balance to be struck between the debtors and the creditors, which revealed rather than begat the poverty which now no effort can conceal.

But the question arises, why have not the properties been sold by the necessitous and purchased upon terms that would admit of careful and remunerating cultivation; in other words, why have not the laws of supply and demand dispossessed the absentee landlords, converted the mortgagees into resident proprietors, and thus restored the equilibrium between labor and capital? This is the Jamaica problem. Without presuming to be able to give it a scientific solution, at least within such space as the columns of a daily journal can spare for the purpose, I think I can indicate the direction in which such a solution may be found by those who choose to go in quest of it.

I have already stated that nine-tenths of the land is owned by non-resident proprietors. That involves the necessity in trusting its culture to agents. The agency for an estate of two hundred acres, costs on an average, not less than for one of a thousand acres, and the larger the estate, therefore, the less the relative expense of its agencies.

Again, it would not be worth while for a non-resident to keep up the supervision of a moderate sized farm, three thousand miles from home. Nothing less than the profits of a very large estate could compensate him for the trouble and expense of keeping up a force of attornies, agents and book-keepers, and for the absence of that personal devotion to its management, which none but a proprietor ever feels.

To these and other circumstances, which it is not material now to enumerate, may be attributed the tendency which has been active here since the settlement of the island by the English, to accumulate real estate in the hands of large proprietors, and to exterminate from the soil, all men of small capital. Till recently, such a thing was never known as a small farm of fifty or a hundred acres, to be put under culture for profit. Such a place would be called a *penn* here, which is the name by which they designate a country residence, and would be appropriated to kitchen and ornamental gardening, parks, and orchards, but would not be reckoned a productive part of the proprietor's estate. Out of one hundred and forty sugar estates in Jamaica, selected indiscriminately, the average size of each estate was over 1,202 acres. There is no reason to doubt that the average size throughout the whole island is still greater. For example, eight estates, which have been abandoned in the parish of St. Ann, contained in the aggregate 10,339 acres; one in St. Dorothy, and the only one, contained 1,406; two in St. John, contained 2,960; two in Vere, contained 3,860; seventeen in Clarendon, contained 23,737; in Port-Royal, one contained 1,780; in St. Davids, two contained 3,662; in St. Elizabeth, six contained 18,010; and in Westmoreland, two contained 3,889.

Of course, estates like these can only be owned and cultivated by men of large capital, who are generally unwilling to sell fragments of their property for the reasons I have already suggested. Besides considering it unprofitable to own a small estate, which they have to commit to the expensive management of agents, they have an idea that no money is to be made here except from sugar, rum, and coffee, articles which the negroes know how to produce as well as, or better, than the whites. If they attempt anything else, the negroes must learn how to do the work, and the white superintendents are generally too ignorant, too lazy, or too indifferent, to take the trouble to teach them. To cultivate either of the great staples I have mentioned, it has always been esteemed necessary to have very expensive works attached to each estate, costing generally rom ten to forty or fifty thousand pounds. I have seen Sugar works here which cost £60,000. Of course the expense of the works does not increase in proportion to the size of the property; on the contrary, like the expenses of superintendence, it costs but little less for machinery to manufacture the sugar and the rum for an estate of two hundred acres than for one five times its size. Hence it is supposed that the value of a large estate would be impaired by dividing it, and that the larger it is, the greater is its worth per acre. It is not convenient for me to stop now to show, as I will be able to, in another communication, how entirely wrong the planters are in their facts, and in their inferences; it is enough at present for me to state what will not be disputed, that the whole proprietorship of the island is infected with the impression that the real estate is valuable in an inverse ratio to the number of proprietors; that the more simple the kind of labor required, the greater will be its product, and that sugar, rum and coffee, can be produced on that account, more profitably than anything else.

The consequence is, that when a proprietor sells a property, whether from necessity or choice, he insists upon selling the whole of it, and the purchaser generally insists upon buying the whole. The residents of the island are, for the most part, too poor to buy, and hence non-residents have usually been the purchasers, when any sales were made. In this way, all the evils and abuses of absenteeism have been perpetuated, and the few sales which have occurred, have contributed nothing, apparently, to the restoration of the equilibrium between labor and capital, which must precede any permanent prosperity in Jamaica.

Another consequence of this delusion about the necessity of preserving the present monstrous proportions of the estates, is that the most of the capital invested here is appropriated to the two or three favorite staples which I have mentioned, and the island is compelled to import nearly everything it consumes. It will hardly seem credible that a country which can grow any kind of grain, almost without culture, should import all its flour, its meal, its rice and immense quantities of peas and beans for the consumption of its own population; that a country which supports a larger variety of valuable forest trees than any other tract of its size in the world, should import all its lumber, its shingles, its staves, its heading and its hoop poles; that an island which, if left to run wild, would afford better grazing to cattle all the year around than can be procured at any season in any one of the United States, unless it be Texas, with cultivation, should import all its smoked and salt beef, all its salt pork, hams and tongues, most of its butter, lard, cheese, candles and soap; and yet incredible as it may appear, such has been the custom in Jamaica for years, as the following table which I found in in De Cordova's *Mercantile Intelligencer*, a very useful paper, published periodically in Kingston, will demonstrate.

IMPORTS

Into the Island of Jamaica (Kingston and the Outports) from 11th October, 1848, to 10th Oct., 1849.

		1849.	1848.
Flour, barrels		70,634	82,399
Meal, ditto		24,716	21,949
Bread, cwts.		6,386	11,280
Rice, lbs.		4,587,155	2,944,314
Corn, bushels		87,003	123,133
Peas and Peans, bushels		11,466	13,759
Barley, Oats, and Rye, do.		1,117	745
Wheat, do.		10,909	7,867
Beef, barrels		1,741	2,181
Pork, do.		17,231	21,176
Wet Tongues, do.		417	414
Dry Tongues	} cwts.	2,264	5,807
Beef and Hams			
Butter, firkins		14,032	14,677
Lard, do.		7,787	7,369
Herrings, boxes		4,590	1,159
Mackerels, do.		34,650	30,560
Alewives, do.		4,220	4,250
Herrings, do.		15,230	15,721
Codfish, quintals		91,439	112,455
Cheese, cwts.		1,406	1,866
Refined Sugar, lbs.		57,404	43,796
Candles, Sperm, boxes		1,478	677
Do. Composition, do.		1,163	1,172
Do. Tallow, do.		11,436	9,250
Soap, boxes		52,706	42,937
Tobacco, manufactured, lbs.		253,610	224,497
Do. leaf, lbs.		94,751	309,879
Bricks, number		399,700	929,520
Staves, R. O.		967,688	1,336,715
Do. W. O. and Heading		503,653	642,258
Hogshead Shooks		1,862	1,876
Puncheon do.		818	4,509
Lumber, W. P. feet		3,632,274	4,544,766
Do. P. P. feet		448,063	2,021,685
Shingles, Cypress		894,700	1,714,215
Do. Cedar		3,124,664	4,067,000
Wood Hoops		837,811	1,020,181
Hardwood and other Timbers, ft.		19,321	8,333

It will be perceived by this table, that the importation of salt fish is very large, and yet the waters around Jamaica abound with some of the finest fish in the world. The people will send to Maine for lumber, and pay $25 a thousand feet for it, rather than be at the trouble of cutting down their own magnificent forests. There is not a single saw mill upon the land. There are no manufactures of any kind here except of sugar and rum. Even their brick they import. The hilly surface of the country supplies an abundance of water power, over forty constant rivers, and over two hundred rivulets, and yet there is not such a thing as a water wheel to be found in use, except on the plantations and for agricultural purposes.

So entirely, indeed, are the capital and industry of the island absorbed in the culture of favorite staples on these large estates, that common articles of table consumption in Kingston are higher than in any part of England or the United States. I will give you a list of prices paid last week at the hotel where I am stopping, for articles, every one of which could be cultivated in Jamaica with the utmost ease and abundance, and ought to be sold for prices far below the current rates for the same articles in any city in the United States:

Butter, per lb., 37 1-2 cents; cow's milk, per quart, 18 3-4 cents; goat's milk, per quart, 25 cents; American cheese, per lb., 25 cents; English do., 37 1-2 cents; potatoes, per lb., 6 1-4 cents; eggs, 2 for 6 1-4 cents—at Christmas holydays 5 cents a piece; garlic, per lb., 25 a 37 1-12 cents; flour, per lb., 12 a 18 cents—per barrel, $16 a $18; corn meal, do., $12 a 14; hams, at retail, per lb., 25 cents; lard, per lb., 21 cents; onions, per lb., 12 1-2 cents.

Nothing can be apparently more unnatural, than for the people of this island, in their present poverty-stricken condition, to be paying such prices as these for their daily food; and yet nothing is more inevitable, as long as the land is held by a few absentee landlords, in such large quantities.

In my next I will endeavor to trace the connection between the condition of things which I have been describing, and the future destiny of Jamaica as I read it.

The *Boston Atlas*, the leading Whig journal of Massachusetts, but which has failed to sustain Mr. Webster in his attempt to recall the people of that State to a proper sense of their 'duties under the Constitution,' makes the following comments upon the Bill for the Recapture of Fugitive Slaves, which Webster declares his intention "to support with all its provisions, to the fullest extent."

MASON'S BILL.

We have been frequently asked to publish Mason's Bill—the people desire to see it. They wis to know what it is. Copies of it have been published. We have refrained from printing it until we could get an official copy, which copy we now have, and we transcribe it entire.

A BILL to provide for the more effectual execution of the third clause of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That when a person held to service or labor in any State or Territory of the United States, under the laws of such State or Territory, shall escape into any other of the said States or Territories, the person to whom such service or labor may be due, his, or her agent, or attorney, is hereby empowered to seize or arrest such fugitive from service or labor, and take him or her before any judge of the circuit or district courts of the United States, or before any commissioner, or clerk of such courts, or marshal thereof, or any postmaster of the United States, or collector of the customs of the United States, residing or being within such State wherein such seizure or arrest shall be made, and upon proof to the satisfaction of such judge, commissioner, clerk, marshal, postmaster, or collector, as the case may be, either by oral testimony, or affidavit taken before and certified by any person authorized to administer an oath under the laws of the United States, or of any State, that the person so seized, or arrested under the laws of the State or Territory from which he or she fled, owe service or labor to the person claiming him or her, it shall be the duty of such judge, commissioner, clerk, marshal, postmaster, or collector, to give a certificate thereof to such claimant, his, or her agent or attorney, which certificate shall be a sufficient warrant for taking and removing such fugitive from service or labor, to the State or Territory from which he or she fled.

Sec. 2. *And be it furthr enacted*, That when a person held to service or labor, as mentioned in the first shction of this act, shall escape from such service or labor, as therein mentioned, the person to whom such service or labor may be due, his, or her agent, or attorney, may apply to any one of the officers of the United States, named in said section, other than a marshal of the United States, for a warrant to seize and arrest such fugitive, and upon affidavit being made before such officer, (each of whom for the purposes of this act is hereby authorized to administer an oath or affirmation,) by such claimant, his or her agent, that such person does, under the laws of the State or Territory from which he or she fled, owe service or labor to such claimant, it shall be, and is hereby, made the duty of such officer, to and before whom such application and affidavit is made, to issue his warrant to any marshal of any of the courts of the United States to seize and arrest such alleged fugitive, and to bring him or her forthwith, or on a day to be named in such warrant, before the officer issuing such warrant, or either of the other officers mentioned in said first section, except the marshal to whom the said warrant is directed, which said warrant or authority, the said marshal is hereby authorized and directed in all things to obey.

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That upon affidavit made as aforesaid by the claimant of such fugitive, his agent or attorney, after such certificate has been issued, that he has reason to apprehend that such fugitive will be rescued by force from his or their possession, before he can be taken beyond the limits of the State in which the arrest is made, it shall be the duty of the officer making the arrest to retain such fugitive in his custody, and to remove him to the State whence he fled, and there to deliver him to said claimant, his agent, or attorney. And to this end, the officer aforesaid is hereby authorized and required to emply so many persons as he may deem necessary to overcome such force, end to retain them in his service so long as circumstances may require. The said officer and his assistants, while so employed, to receive the same compensation, and to be allowed the same expenses as are now allowed by law for transportation of criminals, to be certified by the judge of the district within which the arrest is made, and paid out of the treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That before such charges are incured, the claimant, his agent, or attorney, shall secure to said officer payment of the same, and in case no actual force be opposed, then they shall be paid by such claimant, his agent, or attorney.

Sec. 4. *And be it further enacted*, When a warrant shall have been issued by any of the officers under the second section of this act, and there shall be no marshal or deputy marshal within ten miles of the place where such warrant is issued, it shall be the duty of the officer issuing the same, at the request of the claimant, his agent, or attorney, to appoint some fit and discreet person, who shall be willing to act as marshal, for the purpose of executing said warrant; and such persons so appointed shall, to the extent of executing such warrant, and detaining and transporting the fugitive named therein' have all the power and the authority, and he with his assistants, entitled to the same compensation and expenses provided in this act, in cases where the services are performed by the marshals of the courts.

Sec. 5 *And be it further enacted*, That any person who shall knowingly and willingly obstruct or hinder such claiment, his agent or attorney, or any person or persons assisting him, her, or them, in so serving or arresting such fugitive from service or labour, or shall rescue such fugitive from such claimant, his agent or attorney, when so arrested, pursuant to the authority herein given or declared, or shall aid, abet, or assist such person so owing service or labour to escape from such claimant, his agent or attorney, or shall harbor or conceal such person, after notice that he or she was a fugitive from labor, as aforesaid, shall, for either of the said offences, forfeit and pay the sum of one thousand dollars, which penalty may be recovered by and for the benefit of such claimant, by action of debt in any court proper to try the same, saving, moreover, to the person claiming such labor or service, his right of action for, on account of the said injuries, or either of them.

Sec. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That when said person is seized or arrested under, and by virtue of the said warrant, by such marshal, and is brought before either of the officers aforesaid, other than said marshal, it shall be the duty of such officer to proceed in the case of such person, in the same way as he is directed and authorized to do when such person is seized and arrested by the person claiming him, or by his or her agent, or attorney, and is brought before such officer under the provisions of the first section of this act.

AMENDMENTS intended to be proposed by Mr. Mason to the bill (S. 23) to provide for the more effectual execution of the third clause of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States.

At the end of section 5, add:

And any person or persons offending against the provisions of this section to be moreover deemed guilty of a misdemeanor in obstructing the due execution of the laws of the United States, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in the sum of one thousand dollars, one-half whereof shall be to the use of the informer; and shall also be imprisoned for the term of twelve months.

At the end of section 6, add:

And in no trial or hearing under this act shall the testimony of such fugitive be admitted in evidence.

This is a most remarkable bill, and deserves serious consideration, particularly as it is now probable that it will be carried through Congress. The bill provides that any person who shall make complaint against a colored person, before any Judge of the Circuit Court of the United States, or clerk of such Court, or postmaster, or collector, &c., that such person is his slave, he is to be delivered up without trial, and hurried off into bondage. It further provides that, if the claimant has reason to apprehend that such fugitive will be rescued, he is to be retained, and to be removed from the State in which he is arrested, and carried to the State from which he fled, or from which he alleged that he fled, and the expense the United States Treasury to pay. It is further provided in the bill and amendments, that if any citizen give the alleged fugitive from Slavery a shelter, he shall be subject to a fine of one thousand dollars, and *to imprisonment for one year*. And that the alleged fugitive, when claimed by the slaveholder, shall not be allowed to testify—or to use the words of the Act, "*The testimony of such fugitive shall not be admitted in evidence!*" This is the bill which is now before Congress. Now we have no hesitation to declare, that the passage of a law like this would be a disgrace to the age in which we live, a libel upon the Constitution, a living anathema against a Republican government, and a wanton violation of the laws of God. It is a law that would be a dead letter in New England, and we believe in most of the free States. It abrogates trial by Jury, and annuls the writ of Habeas Corpus, and is therefore unconstitutional; for the constitution of the United States provides especially that "the privilege of the writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it." The bill is unconstitutional, because it denies the right of trial by jury, which is expressly guaranteed by the constitution of the United States, "*where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars.*" If the liberty of a man, his wife and children be worth twenty dollars, and there are few, we think, who will deny the fact, then a jury trial is guaranteed by the constitution under which this law is sought to be enacted. The idea that because the constitution gives to the slaveholder the right to reclaim his fugitive, that therefore the great landmarks and safeguards of freedom which have come down to us from the days of King John, are to be annulled or set aside, is preposterous, and will not for a moment be allowed by a free people. Inasmuch, as life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happines, are the most valued rights possessed by man, therefore is it right that they should be walled round with adamant, lest he should be wrongfully deprived of them. We are not the people, nor is this the age in which to re-enact or re-inforce the obsolete statutes of the dark ages; we value the blessings of liberty too highly, we regard the constitution of the United States with too much veneration, we hold the memories of the illustrious authors of that Charter of Liberty in too much reverence, to favor a law like the one sought to be imposed upon the country by the fanaticism of a minority faction. If such a law could ever be enforced in the free States, the day in which it could have been has passed away, and like the sceptre of Judah, it has passed away forever. As, journalists, we have ever sought to inculcate in the hearts of our people a love for the constitution, —a firm, unyielding attachment to the Union of the States; we have warred against the organization of sectional parties; we have yielded freely and fully to the South their just rights; we never have, and never will seek to deprive them of one of the least of them. We have discountenanced on all occasions the growth of radicalism and innovation upon well established and well settled principles. In a word, we are a conservative in principle and feeling; not indeed of that bigotted school which regards every change as a fault, and every new thing as of no merit; and it is as conservatives and as Whigs that we oppose this contemplated law. It is calculated to loosen the hold which our people have for the constitution and the Union. They have ever regarded them as the conservators of rational liberty and the true means of national glory and renown. Give them to believe that they are the conservators of human bondage, and of sectional oppression, and you strike dead the love and veneration in which we hold them.

We do not wonder at the alarm with which many people regard this law. When Elizabeth Gaunt was burnt at the stake in London, in the reign of the Second James, under the law of treason, as expounded by Judge Jeffries, because she had given the shelter of her house to a fugitive suspected of being concerned in the Rye House plot, the manly heart of the English nation gave utterance to its grief, and the same page of history which embalms her name and sufferings with the halo of a martyr's crown, records the infamy of her brutal judges and accusers, and consigns them to ages of perpetual ignominy. And why? Because the law and the judge violated the law of justice and the instincts of our nature, which the Creator of the universe has for a wise purpose implanted in the human soul. Does any one believe that it could be possible to keep imprisoned in Massachusetts, for a twelvemonth, a man whose only crime was, that he gave to the least of his fellow beings a shelter or a cup of water, when, faint and hungry, he asked for them, in his race from the darkness of bondage into the sunlight of freedom. If so, they know very little of the popular sentiment of New England. A law that contemplates such action can never be enforced among a truly intelligent and free people.

The free States would regard a law of this kind as verifying the complaints made by Garrison and his fellow disunionists, against the Constitution of the United States, that it is a pro-slavery Constitution. Gibbon, in his Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, states that the slaves of that nation seldom tried to escape, because there was no city of refuge, no spot of earth then known, over which the laws of the Empire did not extend. To the slave, the Roman Empire was one great prison house.—Now, then, the bill of Mr. Mason would make the American Empire another prison house. Our territory extends from one ocean to the other, and we fear it is in time destined to embrace nearly the whole continent. We ask if there is not to be one foot of land, one place of repose sacred to liberty? Is the law of Slavery to be co-extensive with our possessions. If Mr. Mason's bill truly expounds the principles of the constitution then it must be so. nothing, in our judgment, can be further from the spirit of the Constitution. The men who made it were not of the Mason stamp. The clause which was put in our Constitution, concerning the return of fugitive slaves, never contemplated anything like Mason's bill. The clause is in fact taken from the ordinance of '87, an ordinance which forever dedicated to freedom every inch of new territory then belonging to the United States. It was put in the Constitution as a compromise. There was to be no more slave territory—the South were bound on that point; yet how have they kept it? They have gone on adding new slave territory, and bringing in new slave States. They have been false to their part of the agreement. They have made laws to imprison our free colored sailors when they reach their ports, clearly against the express letter of the Constitution, and in defiance of a decision of their own courts. They drove from their cities the authorized agents of our State, who went there to try, in a legal and constitutional manner, the question of redress, and to test, in the highest court of the Union the binding force of these laws. In a word, they set at defiance, in the case of Mr. Hoar, the Constitution, and the sacred laws of hospitality. Yet notwithstanding all this, they expect us to enforce a law like that given above, refusing to the accused person any right of defence, and declaring that the testimony of the fugitive shall not be admitted in evidence in his own case. Perhaps the North may submit to all this, but we doubt it.

In the discussion of these questions we know how liable our motives are to be misconstrued. We have in the above expressed our candid convictions, and desire that they may be considered on their own merits, without reference to their bearing upon any one whomsoever. We have been led to infer from the debates in the Washington papers, that there has been another amendment offered to the above bill, to the effect that a board of Commissioners shall be appointed in the several States, before whom the applications for the return of fugitive slaves shall be heard. We have tried to find this amendment, but have not succeeded. Should such an amendment have been offered and is, adopted, there would be some difficult we judge, in finding respectable men who would accept the post.

MASON'S BILL

In order that our readers may distinctly understand the concession which some of our Northern Senators are prepared to offer to the South in relation to the surrender of fugitive slaves, we give below the bill known as Mason's Bill, which was introduced into the Senate by Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, and amended by Mr. Mason, of Virginia.

* * * * * * *

The amendments to this Bill proposed by Mr. Mason are: 1st, That in addition to the fine of $1000 for *aiding and abetting* the escape of a fugitive, for *harboring* and *concealing* him, the offender "*shall also be imprisoned twelve months*;" and 2d. That "*in no trial or hearing under this act shall the testimony of such slave be received.*"

It is this Bill, as amended by Mr. Mason, which Mr. Webster has pledged himself in the Senate "to support, *with all its provisions, to the fullest extent.*"

According to this Bill, any person claimed as a slave may be summarily arrested and brought before, not even a judicial tribunal, but a postmaster, a collector, a clerk, or commissioner of a United States court—before any man holding any office, however humble, under the Federal government, and on the *bare declaration or affidavit* of the claimant, which cannot be gainsaid by any testimony from the alleged fugitive, shall be delivered over to bondage without redress. It is not even necessary that the United States officer before whom the hearing is had should be a *resident* of the State in which the arrest is made. A slave-hunter may come on from the South to New York, bringing with him a subaltern of the Federal government; they may take up their quarters at the Astor House; the hunter may make affidavit to the *subaltern* that a servant in that house is his slave; the counter declaration of the person so claimed cannot be received; but on that single affidavit, made to an officer of the United States *

is found, as to the fact whether he is a slave. A demand so reasonable, so just, so in accordance with the whole spirit of the Constitution and with common law, one would think that Daniel Webster would be foremost to demand; but no, he will support Mr. Mason's Bill, "*to its fullest extent.*"

For ourselves, we have a single word to say in this matter.

If this Bill should pass, it would not alter in the least our practice in relation to fugitive slaves. Should the weary, panting fugitive pause at our door and seek admittance, that door should be opened to him and shut against his pursuer, until the latter could produce a proper *constitutional* warrant for his arrest; we should yield not to the claimant but to a proper officer of the law, or one duly clothed with its authority; and if, meanwhile, the fugitive should escape to a place of safety through our protection and connivance, then, in default of paying a thousand dollars, we should take the twelvemonth's imprisonment--that is all. If there is need of another exhibition of what conscience, the love of right, and the fear of God can do or endure against unjust and tyrannical laws, the men are not wanting who give the world that lesson. Good, quiet, peaceable citizens they are too, as were Peter, John, and Paul, the Huguenots, the Covenanters, and the Puritans, and as the Quakers are at this day. Mr. Webster ought to know enough of the power of conscience to take that element into account as affecting the practicability of any such measure of compromise as he has pledged himself to support. Our answer to this whole infamous scheme of slave-catching is—IT CAN'T BE DONE. There is a higher legislation on this subject which some men will regard: "*Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him.*" Deut. 23: 15, 16.—*The Independent.*

SPEECH OF HON. J. R. GIDDINGS,

OF OHIO,

In the House of Representatives, Monday, March 18, 1850.

In Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California.

Mr. GIDDINGS said he regarded it as very desirable that gentlemen should understand each other, and that the issue between us should be defined, in order that the country might understand distinctly the questions on which we differ.

Complaints are made and reiterated by Southern gentlemen, that we are encroaching on the rights of the slave interest; but there is an apparent reluctance to come down to particulars, and to define those rights which they allege have been invaded. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] told us, in bold language, that "*this is a pro-slavery government.*" But how far, or in what respects it is such, he has not pointed out. Was it founded solely, or in part, for the support of Slavery?—for the purposes of oppression? He tells us that we "*are bound to maintain the dominion of the slaveholders over their slaves with our blood;*" that we "*are bound to carry Slavery wherever our flag floats and we have exclusive jurisdiction.*"

Now, if this be the doctrine of the Constitution, gentlemen of the North ought to understand it. Duty admits of no medium course, by which we shall keep our covenant *in part*, and violate it in other parts.

We of the North, also, complain of encroachments upon our rights. These should be pointed out with precision and maintained with firmness, or they should be abandoned and surrendered. There is no intermediate course consistent with duty. I, for one, discard all compromises, and reject all offers to compromise. I came here to enforce, to carry out the provisions of the Constitution, not to compromise, nor to surrender the rights secured to us by that instrument.

I regard the constitutional obligations of this Government towards the institution of Slavery as too obvious to be misunderstood by statesmen. The line of demarcation which separates the people of the free States from the support of Slavery has been so plainly drawn, that it would seem no intelligent, unprejudiced mind could mistake it. It is, however, true, that much obscurity is thrown upon the subject by the ingenuity and the sophistry of those who profess to reason upon it.

Much has been said about Slavery being the "creature of municipal law." Men in both political parties now urge, that "Slavery cannot exist, unless sustained by *municipal law.*" They say that this is the doctrine of jurists; that the most profound judges have so decided. Others deny this doctrine. Now, what is the fact? History shows us that it was introduced into Virginia, and existed there for years, without any municipal regulation or authority. We know from history that it existed in each of the slave States of this Union long prior to the enactment of any laws on the subject. It found its way into Oregon, into California, Deseret, and, if we are to credit reports, it has been in New Mexico, without any law. It has been sustained in all these States and Territories, not by municipal law, but by the superior physical and intellectual power of the white over the colored people. This was Slavery in *fact*, but not in *law*. For instance: Slavery continued in Ohio, even against the provisions of our Constitution, and in violation of all our laws, as late as the year 1840. It exists in Illinois to this day. Slaves are there bought and sold, not merely *without* law, but *against* law. But when those slaves become intelligent, and claim their rights before any court, the judges say that "*Slavery is the creature of municipal enactment;* that *there is no such enactment in Illinois, and therefore there is no Slavery in that State.*" The judge means by this, there is no *legal* Slavery there; while all are aware that negroes are there held in abject servitude, are oppressed and degraded, sold, and transferred from one professed owner to another, for the reason that the existing laws of that State are not enforced.

In a state of nature, the rights of all men are equal; but the superior intellectual and physical power of one man is often exerted to subject others to his will. In that State, however, each possesses the right of self-defence. Not so in slave States.—There, the right of the slave to protect his liberty, or his life, is taken away by the laws of such State. For instance: if a slave in Virginia lifts his hand against his master in self-defence, the master may at once slay him with impunity. But this right of the master depends on the law of that State; and the moment the master goes beyond the jurisdiction of that State, this right ceases. Let him bring his slave to Ohio, and the moment they stand on our soil, under the jurisdiction of our laws, the slave becomes a *man*, possessing the equal rights, and powers, and privileges, with the master. Such is the case whenever they go beyond the jurisdiction of Virginia into free territory.

These principles have often been advanced. They were familiar to our fathers. They had been declared by the courts of Great Britain, prior to our Revolution. Slavery at that time was discountenanced in all the colonies, excepting perhaps South Carolina and Georgia.

My colleague [Mr. Campbell] has shown in an able manner, that the objects of the people of the South, before and at the commencement of the Revolution, was the entire abolition of Slavery and of all slave laws. These objects were proclaimed in language most direct and appropriate, in 1776, when entering upon the war of the Revolution. After the close of that memorable struggle, the Confederated Congress, in 1783, sent out an address to the People of the United States, penned by Mr. Madison, in which they say, "Let it be remembered, finally, that it has been the pride and the boast of America that the rights for which she contended *were the rights of human nature.*" These sentiments then prevailed in all the States.

Each State at that time held jurisdiction over its western territory, and, so far as its ships were concerned over the high seas. Thus the laws of Virginia extended over her northwestern territory, and over all ships belonging to the people of that State while sailing upon the high seas; and Slavery, of course, existed both in that territory and on board every ship thus subjected to the laws of that State.

In 1786, she ceded her territory to the United States. The jurisdiction was transferred, her laws ceased to be in force there, and Slavery ceased with them. By the ordinance of 1787, Congress consecrated that vast region to freedom, by ordaining that Slavery should never more exist there. This was expected by the people. They desired it. Up to this period, each State held jurisdiction upon the high seas, and Slavery continued to exist there.—But the convention then in session for the purpose of framing the Constitution, desired to make the high seas, also, *free*. South Carolina and Georgia insisted on retaining the slave trade: Northern members would not go into a union with a people devoted to that commerce, with powers to continue it indefinitely: and a compromise of the subject was the result.

By the 8th section of the first article of the Constitution, the States surrendered to Congress all jurisdiction over commerce and navigation of the high seas; and by the ninth section of the same article, it was provided that Congress should not prohibit the slave trade until the year 1808.

This stipulation, connected with the history of its adoption, shows, in the most conclusive manner, the hostility then existing against that commerce in our own species. All expected that it would be abolished at the earliest moment at which Congress should possess the power to carry into effect the wishes and intentions of the people. Acting in accordance with this expectation, Congress prohibited the importation of slaves, under heavy penalties, by statute enacted in 1807, but which did not take effect until the first of January, 1808.

This compromise of the Constitution has been fully carried out. The South enjoyed the benefits of the slave trade for the time stipulated, and the whole matter has passed by forever. Yet, this compromise is cited by the gentleman from Georgia, to sustain the doctrine that this is a "pro-slavery Government," and the power given by the Constitution for Congress to prohibit Slavery under our flag, after 1808, he construes into an obligation to protect it, in all coming time, wherever our flag may float. Such is the monstrosity of the slaveholding construction of the Constitution.

The gentleman from Georgia also cites that clause of the Constitution which relates to fugitive slaves, for the purpose of proving that we are bound to maintain the master's right to his slave with our blood. Under the old Confederation, when a slave escaped into another State he became free. At the formation of the Constitution, an amendment was presented, making it the duty of the free States to arrest and imprison fugitive slaves in the same manner they do fugitives from justice. But the amendment was rejected. The matter was compromised by a stipulation that the free States should "*pass no law nor regulation by which the slave should be discharged from the service of his master.*" The construction which this clause has received from the Supreme Court, makes it the duty of the free States, not to *act*, but to *abstain* from action.

Now, sir, I am not aware that any State has passed laws to discharge fugitives from service. On the contrary, I believe, every State has abstained from such legislation. That constitutes the whole duty of the free States. They owe no further duties on this subject under the Constitution. We live up to our compact. We admit it to the full extent. There we stop. This stipulation can imply nothing further than is expressed. It has relation to fugitive slaves only. No inference beyond that can be drawn from it. How gentlemen can infer from this clause that we are bound to maintain the power of the master over his slave with our blood, is another of those monstrous assumptions which slaveholders are accustomed to make, but for which they can assign no reason whatever.

There is no action obligatory upon the free States. They fulfil their whole duty by abstaining from action. Ohio does this, and I believe all the free States do it. The last clause of the paragraph, which, referring to the fugitive slave, says, he "shall be delivered up, on claim of the person to whom such service or labor may be due," has no reference to State legislation, or State action. That proposition was rejected by the Convention. The Supreme Court of the United States have placed a construction upon it. They hold that it refers to the individuals of the State, imposing upon them the duty of permitting the master to take the slave, in the same manner that we surrender up our friends to the officers of justice. They have decided that it is the duty of individuals not to secrete, or to defend the slave against his master. They admit that the individual may act in aid of the master, but deny to the State all power of acting on the subject.

It is worthy of remark, that this is the only instance in which Congress is authorized to take legislation in favor of Slavery. On this point it is conceded that we may pass laws. But by this clause of the Constitution we are only authorized to legislate for the *arrest and return of fugitive slaves.* It is left for us to act agreeably to the dictates of our own judgment. We have the power to pass further laws for this purpose, or we may repeal the law of Congress now in force on that subject. But it gives us no power to go further in support of Slavery, and to pass laws for the protection of that institution within the States. Such interpretation would be a perversion of language, and of the intention of those who framed the Constitution. It was intended to give the master a right to reclaim his fugitive slave, and to Congress power to aid him in reclaiming such fugitive. Here the right and the power end; they extend no further. Nor has the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] informed us in what manner or by what rules of construction he infers any power in Congress, under this clause of the Constitution, to protect Slavery wherever our flag may float; or that it is our duty to *protect it with our blood.*

The next compromise of the Constitution to which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] refers, is that of the slave representation as provided in the 3d clause, 2d section, of the 1st article of the Constitution. In regard to this article, it would appear that no difference of opinion could possibly exist.—There can be no doubt that it was intended to give the slave States an advantage over the free States. The slaves are not represented in this Hall, nor can we legislate for their benefit; but the slaveholders have a representation here, in proportion to the number of slaves they hold in bondage, counting five slaves equal to three freemen. For more than sixty years the slave States have enjoyed this privilege.—No man has ever denied it to be their right under the Constitution. But it is equally plain that this clause was intended to give no further privilege. It alludes to no other subject, and cannot be construed to give any other powers. The gentleman [Mr. Toombs] referred to it to show that this is a slaveholding Government; that we are bound to maintain the master's power over his slave with our blood; and to carry Slavery wherever our flag floats. But the way and manner he brings this clause to sustain his positions, he has failed to show us. I repeat, that the whole object and intention of this clause has been thus far observed and carried out. South Carolina has now three representatives on this floor more than she would be entitled to, according to the number of her freemen; and twenty members from the slave States are admitted here solely by virtue of this superior advantage which the slave States possess over the People of the North.

It gives to the South an influence over our rights and interests, not according to their love of freedom, but proportioned to their disregard of liberty. The holder of five slaves exerts an influence in this Hall and in the Federal Government equal to four citizens of the free States; and the owner of a thousand slaves possesses political powers equal to six hundred citizens of the North.

I know nothing more humiliating to the pride and dignity of our people than this inequality of our political influence. We are placed in a political position between the supercilious master and his crouching menial; superior to the one and inferior to the other. It was a compromise of Northern honor. It gave a bounty to oppression; bestowed privileges on those who disregard "self-evident truth," and trample upon the inalienable rights of man; it has taught Northern men to regard slaveholders as politically entitled to superior consideration; it has taught us subjection to slaveholding dictation. It was the force of this feeling which constrained Northern members on this floor to surrender up their own independence, and for years to unite with the South in excluding from consideration all petitions in relation to Freedom; passed your gag rules; struck down the freedom of debate; sealed the lips of those who advocated the doctrines of political equality; and for many years held the National Government subservient to the slave power. It was this principle which for half a century caused Northern men to tremble at Southern threats to dissolve the Union; which now calls together the timid and irresolute in our commercial cities, to pass resolutions against the maintenance of our own rights. The same feeling of servility is also manifested by a portion of the Northern press, which is always ready to advocate every slaveholding policy. Yet, sir, we abide by the compact. The slave States, from the adoption of the Constitution to this day, have enjoyed this privilege of a superior representation in this Hall and in the elections of President and Vice President. No Northern man has objected to carrying out this provision, which of all others, is the most destructive to our interests and wounding to our pride.

But, sir, this concesssion was never intended to extend beyond what it plainly imports. It gives to the slave States no other privilege than that of representation agreeably to the number of their slaves. It imposes no obligation, whatever, upon the people of the free States to maintain the "master's power over his slave with our blood, nor does it impose upon Congress the duty "*to protect Slavery wherever our flag floats.*" Nor can any inference, whatever, be drawn from this clause of the Constitution beyond its plain and obvious apportionment of representation and direct taxation.

In order to establish the duty of this Government to sustain Slavery we are referred to the obligation imposed upon us to "protect each of the States from invasion, and against domestic violence."

This provision extends to the free as well as to the slave States. History informs us that the rebellion in Massachusetts was the occasion of its adoption. Mr. Madison informs us that members from the slave States assured the Convention that they neither needed nor required any provision of the kind. But no man can mistake the object and design of this section. We are bound to protect every State from invasion. This protection is thrown around the *State*, including all the people therein; the righteous and the wicked, the bond and the free; the black and the white, the hardened assassin, and the innocent child, are all protected: And you may allege that this clause was adopted to protect pirates and murderers, with the same propriety that you can assert it to have been adopted to protect slaveholders or any other men of a particular character.

The same reasoning applies to the suppression of domestic violence. We are bound to protect the whole people of the State against domestic violence. We do not institue an inquiry as to character of the people! We do not ask whether they are slaves or masters, white or black, righteous or wicked. The insurgents are shot down by our troops without inquiring who they are! The master found in arms is shot down precisely as the slave, and the insurgent slave is butchered with just as little ceremony as the insurgent master. Indeed we know of no distinctions in such case. Our troops have nothing to do with *Slavery;* their duty is to quell the violence. That done every slave in the State may walk off to Canada, in full view of our army, and they possess neither the right nor the constitutional power to interfere, or in any manner to prevent their escape, But in case of invasion or insurrection, the power of the Government in repelling the one or suppressing the other is unlimited by the Constitution. The whole physical power of the nation may then be brought in to action for that purpose, and if deemed necessary by the Executive, who is the commander of the army and navy, he may liberate every slave in such State for the purpose of saving the people or of restoring peace. This is a power, however, lying behind the Constitution, based upon the right of self-defence, upon the duty of preserving the Government, and existing only in time of foreign or of civil war.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have examined what we so often hear called the "Compromises of the Constitution." They consist entirely in the privilege conceded to the slave States, to continue the slave trade until 1808; to pursue and recapture their fugitive slaves; and to be allowed a representation in Congress proportioned to the number of their slaves. They have no further claims whatever in favor of Slavery. Beyond these we are bound to act for Freedom; for the political equality of all men; for the maintenance of "the rights of all to life and liberty." Aside from these, the people of the free States possess the clear and indisputable right to be separated, and entirely exempted, from all participation in the support of Slavery, to be purified from its moral guilt and entirely absolved from its disgrace. If we do not thus separate ourselves from its moral and political contagion, it will be owing to the vitiated sentiment and the servile feelings of Northern members. If we remain contaminated with the crimes attendant upon the slave trade in this District and upon our Southern coast, the responsibility must rest upon those Northern members of Congress who are willing to continue their participation in this sale of men and of women, this treason against God and humanity.

But the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Toombs] says that we "have heretofore sustained the right of the master to hold his slave upon the 'high seas,' and even in foreign ports.'" If this were correct, it would impose upon us no duty to violate the Constitution and defeat the entire objects for which our Government was instituted. But I will examine this point. Until the year 1808, the people of South Carolina and Georgia were *permitted* to import slaves. But they went to Africa at their *own peril.* We furnished them no protection. If, in attempting to seize and enslave the unoffending people of that country, they were slain, all regarded their fate as most just and righteous. When their victims were placed on shipboard, these dealers in human flesh looked not to this government for protection. They depended upon physical force, upon chains and fetters, the scourge and thumbscrew, the pistol and dagger, for their safety, until they reached the jurisdiction of the slave State to which they hurried their cargo. There the laws of such State threw its protection around them; and if the slaves subsequently resisted their masters, the powers of the State were brought to the master's aid in holding his victim in subjection. But this permission of the slave trade expired in 1808, and the traffic was thenceforth entirely interdicted. At the same time, Congress restricted the coastwise slave trade, by imposing heavy penalties for transporting slaves from one of our own seaports to another, in vessels of less than forty tons burden, or without filing affidavits that the slaves were not imported after the year 1808; and the slave dealers now pursue their vocation on our Southern coast at their own peril, precisely as they pursued the foreign slave trade prior to 1808. The United States have passed no law of Slavery authorizing one man to hold another as property on the "high seas." While there, under the exclusive jurisdiction of our laws, the master has no more right to chastise his slave than the slave has to correct his master. The slave has the same right while there to defend his life and liberty which the master possesses. If either, in the act of legally defending himself, slay his assailant, there is no law of the United States, or of any State, or of nature, or of nature's God, that holds him responsible.

These are the doctrines most obviously applicable to this subject. They are clearly deducible from the Constitution, and should, in my opinion, at all times have been firmly maitained.

Yet it is true that the President and Senate have attempted to exert the national influence to establish the power of the master over his slave on the ocean, under the exclusive jurisdiction of our laws; it is also true that, by fraud and deception, compensation was obtained from the British Government for two cargoes of slaves who were made free by being shipwrecked and landing on British soil; but it is equally true that the imposition was discovered, the right of such protection denied, and all such compensation has been for the last twelve years withheld by England, and such claims have long since been abandoned by the Executive.

When in 1840 the British ministers refused to listen to the claims of this Government for indemnity to the slaveholders, whose victims on board the ship Enterprise had been manumitted by shipwreck, on the British island of New Providence, a distinguished Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. Calhoun,] impatient at delay, offered resolutions in the other end of the Capitol, declaring, in substance, not merely that Slavery existed upon the high seas on board American vessels, but that such vessels carried with them the relation of master and slave, when driven by a stress of weather into the port of a foreign nation. In truth, the resolutions, so far as that body could do, pledged the Nation to sustain the claims of these dealers in human flesh. No member objected to this doctrine, so repugnant to every principle of justice, and so directly opposed to the Constitution and to international law. The voice of Massachusetts, of New England, of New York, and Ohio, was then silent. Not even a vote from the whole North was recorded against these propositions. The spirit of Northern Liberty then slept, so far as that body was concerned; that voice, which is now so ready to abandon the Wilmot Proviso—so willing for the admission of more slave States—so anxious to give further aid to the slaveholder, as he pursues his trembling victim within our free States, was then silent. That Senator opened not his lips, neither did he vote on that occasion. From an examination of the journal, I discover the name of but one Whig from the three States who voted on those resolutions. He voted for their adoption. The others *appear to have been absent.*

Every Southern Senator of both parties, and all Northern Democrats who voted, gave their support in favor of the resolutions. This was in the year 1840; and soon after that period, one of the Senators [Mr. Webster] who *did not vote* was called to preside over the State Department, under President Tyler.

While he was thus guiding the most important branch of the Executive duties, the case of the Creole occurred. That ship sailed from Richmond, with a cargo of slaves, in October, 1841; while on the high seas the slaves rose, asserted their right to freedom, and slew one of the slave-dealers who attempted to reduce them to subjection, and, guiding the ship to the Island of New Providence, went on shore, and flecame entirely free. The piratical dealers, who professed to own the people thus restored to freedom, called on the President to aid them in obtaining indemnity for their loss; and Mr. Webster was requested to carry out the doctrine for which he and other Northern Senators had refused to vote. A statesman bred up and educated in New England, one who had long breathed the free air of the North, who had been taught the languags of freedom, condescended to become the agent and solicitor of those who deal in human flesh, and to exert his official influence to maintain the commerce in the bodies of men and of women.

The attention of the nation, however, was called to these facts by resolutions presented in this body. The proceeding of the Executive was condemned by all. Not even slaveholders were willing to sustain the doctrine. The further prosecution of their infamous claim was given up. The State Department receded from its position; the celebrated resolutions which were intended to establish new principles in the law of nations, remain a dead letter upon the journal of the Senate. The owners of the slaves of the Creole have pocketed their loss; and the slaves themselves are now most of them British subjects, and a few are freemen, residents of our free States. Yet, sir, these attempts of Mr. Calhoun, aided by Southern slaveholders, and of Mr. Webster, and President Tyler, to commit the nation to the doctrines contended for by the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. Toombs,] are now quoted in both ends of the Capitol, to show that we are "bound to carry Slavery wherever our flag floats." This signal *failure* to sustain the doctrine, is constantly cited by slaveholders to demonstrate its correctness.

The reasoning is of that absurd character which requires only to be stated to be appreciated. The views which I have thus advanced are not new. They have been often asserted here and elsewhere; but it seems that no arguments, no facts, no exposure of the sophistry and the absurdity of slaveholding doctrines, will prevent their repetition; and when reasserted, we are constrained to reply to them.

The gentleman from Georgia also insists that slaves are property; that they are recognised as such; and that the Government is bound to protect the master's right to the slave in the same manner that we are bound to protect him in the enjoyment of other property. Such was once the opinion of English jurists, but it was in a darker age. The latest decision to that effect in the English courts bears date more than a hundred years since. In 1772, Lord Mansfield denied the doctrine, and combatted it with such arguments as to set the matter forever at rest in the courts of Great Britain. From the commencement of the Revolution to this day we have refused to admit that slaves are property. This Government has always refused to pay for slaves killed or lost in the public service. In 1816, Congress passed a law making compensation for property lost or destroyed in the service of Government. Pending the bill a motion was made so to amend it as to allow compensation for slaves killed or lost while in the public service, in the same manner as the Government paid for other property; but the amendment was rejected by a large majority, there being only thirty-two members in favor of it. In 1828, the case of "D'Auterive" came before Congress. The slave, horse and cart of the claimant were pressed into the public service against his consent, on the day of battle at New Orleans. His slave and horse were killed, and cart destroyed; and the owner called on Congress to make compensation. A bill was reported paying for the horse and cart, but refusing to pay for the slave. The claim was of the strongest possible character. It was discussed some weeks, when it was laid on the table, and has never been heard from since. In 1832, the case of Larche, of the same character, was rejected. In 1842, another attempt was made to induce Congress to pay for slaves lost in East Florida by the action of our troops in 1814, but the claim was rejected—only thirty-six members voting for it. During the last Congress, efforts were made to pass bills to pay for slaves, but none of them succeeded. In the 28th Congress, a bill to pay for a slave lost in the Florida war came to this body from the Senate. It was committed to the Committee of the Whole House. I was perfectly aware of its character, and called the attention of my venerable and lamented friend from Massachusetts, [Mr. Adams] to it. I know it was his intention to oppose its passage, but on one of those days when bills are hurried through this body under the rules without objection, it passed. I was myself unable to be present, and it escaped the notice of Mr. Adams, and became a law. No man will for a moment pretend that an accident of that character constitutes a precedent or establishes any principle. With this exception, Congress, from the first session under the old Confederation to this day, has rejected the principle that "*man can hold property in man.*" Mr. Madison declared in Convention that "*it would be wrong to admit in the Constitution* THAT THERE COULD BE PROPERTY IN MAN." To this opinion of Mr. Madison, every member assented. No one controverted it. To that doctrine Congress, as well as the Supreme Court of the United States, has at all times adhered. Yet we are constantly told that slaves *are property*, and gentlemen appear determined to overthrow, not merely the practice of the Government, the decisions of the courts, and the Constitution itself, in order to sustain Slavery, but they seem disposed to repeal the law of nature, and reverse the decrees of God himself, in order to degrade his image to the level of the brutes that perish.

I have now answered all the positions of the gentleman from Georgia which I regard as material. I have paid particular attention to his speech, as I am not aware that any other Southern member has dwelt upon the constitutional obligations of this Government towards Slavery. I will now turn my attention to the question of extending Slavery into our newly acquired territories.

It is constantly asserted that, by adopting the Wilmot Proviso, we shall *exclude the people of the South from emigrating to those Territories with their property.*" They charge us with attempting to create "distinctions between the people of the free and those of the slave states" These arguments are unfounded. The exclusion of Slavery is for the express purpose of permitting all men, of every State, and nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, under heaven, to go there "*upon terms of perfect equality.*" We propose to give to *all*, the same protection, the same security to life, liberty, and property, to admit of no distinctions except those of moral worth. It is this "*equality of political rights*" to which Southern men *object*, and not to the want of it. Their excitement arises from the fact, that we recognize *no* distinction, that we will permit no man to hold the body of another at his disposal, to deprive him of liberty, to beat and scourge, to degrade and brutalize him. Such are our objects, and such are the objections to them. If, sir, we permit Slavery to establish itself in these Territories, we shall show ourselves unequal to the discharge of our duties as statesmen, and insensible to our obligations as Christians—we shall deserve and must receive the censure, the condemnation, of the civilized world. It is not my purpose on this point to travel over ground already occupied. The moral turpitude of permitting Slavery and slave markets to be established on territory hitherto consecrated to freedom, has been ably examined by other gentlemen. There is, however, an abstraction, first advanced within the last two years, but now advocated by individuals of both political parties, denying our right to prohibit Slavery in those vast regions. I believe the devotees of this new theory admit that, owning the lands and holding the sovereignty of those Territories in our own hands, we may prohibit the robbing a man of his money, his watch, or his horse; but if the robber goes farther, and commits the greatest of all possible crimes, by robbing his fellowman of his wife and children, of his liberty, his intellectual enjoyments, his future hopes—of himself—such robbery must be permitted, and we have no right to prohibit it.

I stated that this theory was *novel*. It has certainly been discovered since 1776. Then our fathers declared "that Governments were instituted for the very purpose of securing "*the people in the enjoyment of life and liberty.*" Now it is said that, in establishing Government there, we must leave the question of liberty out of view, to be determined by the *people* of that country. Who do gentlemen mean by the *people?* Do they include all persons who now live in New Mexico, or who shall hereafter go there? Do they intend that each human being shall have a voice and a vote on this question of his own liberty? Will they by legislative exactment secure the right of such vote to every man? No, sir; such is not the intention of gentlemen who use this language. They intend that one portion of the people shall determine whether they will rob another portion of their liberty and hold them as *property.* Such is the effect of this policy; yet gentlemen are unwilling to come out before the country and avow this intention in undisguised language.

Again, it is urged that Slavery cannot exist there. In the opening of my remarks, I showed that it has existed in Oregon and California, it now exists in Deseret, and, if we can credit accounts apparently correct, it has existed in New Mexico. In my opinion, the mines of New Mexico will furnish as profitable employment for slaves as can be found upon the face of the earth. That, if permitted, those mines will be filled with a dense slave population. And such we know to be the opinion of slaveholders generally, and they are competent judges. I regard these arguments merely as apologies for leaving the question precisely as slaveholders desire it to be left. Time will not permit me to examine these points farther.

While commenting upon the compromises of the Constitution, I spoke of the slave representation in Congress—the political position in which it placed the freemen of the North; that this position was intermediate between the supercilious master and his abject slave. I then called attention to the effect which this degrading position has had upon members of this body, upon the Northern press, and upon the timid and irresolute men of the North, generally. The question now propounded to us is, *shall this political inequality between ourselves and slaveholders be extended and increased?* Shall we consent or permit the holder of a thousand slaves in the mines of New Mexico to wield the same influence in this Government, and exert the same control over our commercial and national rights and interests, that is held and exerted by six hundred of our intelligent farmers at the North? Now, sir, the motto of our Northern people is, "no slave Territory; no more slave States." We intend to permit no increase of slave power. We will oppose it now, hereafter, and at all times; under all circumstances; in all legal and constitutional ways; by every honorable means. The Northern man who hesitates to oppose this outrage upon the interests, the honor, and the constitutional rights of the North, we regard as a traitor to freedom and to humanity.

But, sir, the most insidious treason against freedom and the North is that which urges upon us the propriety of leaving this question of Slavery entirely to the electors of the Territories. If they establish it, and form State Constitutions of a slaveholding character, then they urge that each shall be admitted into the Union as a slave State; and every holder of five slaves be entitled to an influence over our national rights and interests, equal to four laboring men of the North. He who embraces this insidious mode of degrading the Northern character, adds to his moral and political treason, the baseness of duplicity and of cowardice, and is far less entitled to our respect than he who comes out openly, and frankly declares that Northern laborers are less entitled to respect, and less qualified to discharge political duties than are the slaveholders of the South.

Mr. Chairman, when we say it is our intention to admit "*no more slave States,*" to hold no "*slave territory,*" we mean what we say. On this point we discard the doctrine lately advanced in another part of the Capitol. We totally deny that we are under any moral, political, or constitutional obligation to admit another slave State from Texas. We deny that any contract exists between us and that State. There was a contract proposed, and submitted to the only power in this Government capable of contracting—that is, the treaty-making power. That power rejected it. Texas came into the Union with full notice and full knowledge of these facts. She will not be deceived nor disappointed on this subject, if we refuse to admit a new slave State from her territory. She came in by joint resolution, and not by contract. I then denied, and still deny, that even the treaty-making power could impose on us a union with a foreign slave State upon such unequal terms. But most emphatically do I deny the doctrine that members of this House in 1845 had power to control my vote for the admission of a new State in 1850. They could admit a State, but they could place me under no obligation to act contrary to my own judgment. I am sworn to support the Constitution, and solemnly believe that this increasing and extending of the Slave Power is subversive of the Constitution.

Sir, to admit more slave States, thereby increasing the Slave Power, and surrendering the interests of humanity to the disposal of those who deny the "self-evident truth" of men's equality of natural rights, is not only a palpable violation of the whole spirit of the Constitution, but it is at war with the vital objects, the whole design, of those who established our Government amidst toil and dangers.

The annexation of Texas was conceived and urged, and consummated, with the avowed intention of increasing the Slave Power. I do not charge Northern men with acting on this principle; but we know that the officers of the Government, the Executive, urged it expressly on these grounds. I then denounced it, as unconstitutional in its objects, its designs, and in the manner of its consummation. So too did a distinguished Senator in the other end of the Capitol, who now avows himself ready to vote for admitting these new slave States from Texas, for the very purpose of increasing the Slave Power in this Government.

Sir, what has wrought such a change in the mind of that distinguished Senator? Time will doubtless answer this question, But, sir, holding now, as I then did, that Congress may at any time *repeal* the joint resolution by which Texas was admitted—that those who voted for that resolution could by its adoption impose no duty on me to vote for admitting other new slave States, I shall at all times oppose such admission. These sovereign States, while united under the same Constitution, must be *equal.* Texas brought with her no claim whatever to be divided into four Slave States. She can no more claim a division than Ohio, New York or Pennsylvania. The sole object for such a division is an increase of the Slave Power. To give it greater influence over the rights and the interests of the free States—to enable it more effectually to withstand the progress of truth and justice—to prolong its bloodstrined and barbarous system of brutalizing our fellow men.

But, sir, the day has arrived when the tendency, the effects and consequences of our official acts are known and understood by the People. He who now advocates an increase of the Slave Power, may as well openly and frankly avow his opposition to freedom, his hatred of the "inalienable rights" of man, and declare his intentions to sustain oppression and slavery. Our actions cannot be misunderstood in these times. He whose soul is imbued with the love of justice, of liberty, and of his race, will manifest it by his words, by his acts, by his votes. Sir, those acts and votes are "*known and read of all men.*"

It is also proposed to pass further and more stringent laws for the arrest and return of fugitives slaves; to make every postmaster, and deputy marshal, and other petty officer of this Government, resident in the free States, the catchpole of slave-hunters. We are to impose upon them the obligation to leave their shops or their fields, and give chase to the flying bondman as he hastens from the scene of his oppression; to seize the trembling victim of Southern cupidity; to assist in riveting the cold iron upon his chafed limbs, and then to force him back to a land of chains and sighs, and fears and suffering. Yes, sir, it is now gravely proposed that this Congress of Christian men, at this middle of the nineteenth century, boasting that we are surrounded by the most intelligent, free and virtuous people upon the earth, shall turn our attention and exert our official influence—our legislative power—in favor of the vilest system of oppression known among civilized men; that we shall aid the arrant usurper of the South to hold his grasp upon his fellow-man to compel him to toil and to suffer under the scourge, for the benefit of his oppressor: that we will help rob him of his liberty, his enjoyments, his all, that others may revel in wealth. Sir, I would as soon turn slave-hunter as I would vote for such a law. Yet I do not regret that such a measure is to come before us. I am willing to see members compelled to show their hands. I desire that the country shall understand who is willing thus to degrade the character of American statesmen by prostituting our official powers to such purposes.

But there are circumstances which render such action at this time still more objectionable and humiliating. Since the early history of the State in which I live, men have occasionally come from the slave States and kidnapped our colored people; and when such offenders have been demanded, as fugitives from justice under the Constitution, their surrender by the slave States has, I believe, at all times been refused. Yet, the Representatives of Ohio are now called on to turn round and lend their influence to catch and return Southern slaves! When our free colored people visit the slave States, they are seized, imprisoned, sold, and enslaved; and Southern gentlemen now ask us to pass a law that shall make it the duty of our postmasters, and deputy marshals, to seize and return to bondage those very citizens of Ohio, should they perchance escape from their oppressors in the South, and return to their wives and children in their native State. Will the representatives of Ohio vote for such a law?

The citizens of Massachusetts have been seized in Southern ports, enslaved, sold, degraded and brutalized They now moan and weep in chains. Representatives of the sovereignty of Massachusetts, when sent to those States, to test their proceedings judicially, have been driven by mob violence from their jurisdiction; and their Legislatures have passed laws, prohibiting, under severe penalties, all persons from prosecuting the rights of such enslaved citizens to freedom.

Sir, while the South thus violates and tramples upon the Constitution, while they treat the free States generally, and Massachusetts in particular, with most sovereign contempt, a distinguished statesman of New England, a representative of Massachusetts, comes forward, and, before the nation, chiding the people of the North for their remissness in arresting and returning fugitive slaves, proposes that we shall exert our legislative-powers in favor of Southern piratical slave-hunters.

Sir, the proposition is humiliating. I detest, I execrate such a policy. I have no language capable of describing my own feelings in regard to it. I would as soon legislate to make the people of the free States the slaves of the South, in direct and positive language, as I would vote for such a measure. To me, the slave-hunter is the most detestable human being that lives and moves upon the earth.

We cannot under the Constitution protect or secrete the slave from his master. But the Legislatures of free States may prohibit their own citizens from aiding or assisting the master to track out the panting fugitive, in order again to subject him to the lash and the thumbscrew. Such a law has been introduced into the Legislature of Ohio; and I am free to say, that if there be a crime for which I would hang a citizen of our State, it is that of aiding the slaveholder to seize his trembling victim upon soil consecrated to freedom.

You may pass your proposed law, and it will remain a dead letter upon your statute book. Our people know their rights, they understand their duties to the Government, to their fellow-men, and to their God. The law of kindness, of sympathy for the oppressed, of love to our fellow-men, is written upon our natures by the finger of the Most High. Can you repeal that law of the Almighty? Can you tear from the heart's core our love of justice—our hatred of crime? Sir, no legislation can effect that object.

Sir, we ought not to deceive Southern men. We should say to them, in all frankness and sincerity, that the day for arresting fugitive slaves within our free States has gone by forever. We abide by the Constitution; but that instrument does not give sufficient power to the master to secure his fugitive slave when he once reaches our free States. It has not come up to the expectations of the South in this respect. It fails to fetter the limbs, to stop the flight of their fugitives.—They generally reach Canada, and there find an asylum, and every friend of humanity rejoices at their success.

The Constitution has also failed to protect our colored citizens when they go to Southern States. It has proved defective on this point. We are willing to amend it, but we would strike out the entire provision relating to fugitive slaves. No such clause can find a place in any new Constitution.

In conclusion, I would assure Southern gentlemen, that a portion of our Northern citizens have determined on reforming the abuses which have rendered this nation subservient to the Slave Power.

We wish all to understand distinctly and fully our views and ulterior designs. We intend to limit and confine Slavery to its present bounds; to repeal all acts of Congress which sustain that institution; and totally to separate the people of the free States and the Federal Government from all responsibility of sustaining Slavery or the slave trade; to restore the Government to the position relative to that institution in which it was placed by the Constitution. We then hope to direct its energies and influence of the nation in favor of justice, of truth, of liberty, and of humanity.

I am aware of the efforts now making to arrange and to compromise these questions; to quiet this agitation; to roll back the tide of popular feeling now manifested, not only in our free States, but in Europe, and throughout the civilized world. Sir, feeble and impotent are the powers of Congress, when brought in conflict with that rising voice of the people now heard in every quarter of our nation. Can we, by legislation, take from twenty millions of freemen their consciences, their thoughts, their judgment? Can we prohibit their investigations of truth? This struggle has been going on for centuries. Men may denounce it, but it will go forward. Reforms in all ages, and in all nations have been denounced. Oppression, Guilt, and Crime, always seek silence and darkness; but as intelligence increases, and becomes more and more generally diffused

the end of a fight, if those that have preceded it have been well put, and those that may come hereafter may each be needed to be in succession quicker, sharper, and heavier than that we are about to strike; but never before have we been in an attitude when any blow would have told as well. Such a host of Anti-Slavery warriors of a certain sort of soldiers, the sort that repels invasion, never makes it—never yet gathered behind the Forlorn Hope of this cause; and such a host of the enemy never came out before in open plain to do us battle on such vantage ground, as that whereon we stand. He who calls himself Abolitionist, and does not covet a post in the vanguard at such a moment is wanting to himself, perhaps, more than to the cause.

But we quote here a passage of a letter from a friend in a neighboring State, who makes some practical suggestions which we commend to that class to which we wish to speak. He says:

"Your readers, I presume, are all aware that the annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society is just at hand. The official call they cannot have overlooked, and, if read, it must have impressed itself upon their minds. But how many of them have said, This is a call to *me*? How many of them think within themselves, Do not I owe something, in the way of personal attendance, and manifestation of personal interest in this annual meeting of the friends of the Anti-Slavery cause? Let no reader think that another is meant, *and not he*. It is not possible, indeed, by any means, for your readers and the friends of the cause generally to be present. Yet how many, who never have been present, might be, with but trifling effort and self-denial. In a cause like ours, to which "not many mighty, not many noble, not many wise men after the flesh are called," there is especial need that every one, who has been called, should hold himself ready for all emergencies, and feel that the God of the oppressed has laid a large and solemn work upon him.

"The holding of the annual meeting is not a mere form, as all know who have ever attended it. It is one of the most important influences that can be brought to bear, not only upon the cause directly, but upon the whole Northern mind, and upon the country generally. And the amount of this influence, and its effect upon the popular mind and upon the advancement of the cause, is in proportion to the interest which the friends of the cause manifest, and to the fulness of their attendance. Every part of the Northern States ought to be represented, that a full, earnest and intelligent discussion of future plans may be had.

"And let me offer one or two practical suggestions to all our Anti-Slavery friends. *First:* In any case where it is not altogether easy and convenient for one individual to bear the entire expense of going to and attending the annual meeting, let those who remain at home contribute something towards that expense, and thus enable their representative to feel that he goes supported and cheered by their sympathies. By a little united effort of this kind, it may easily be put in the power of many to attend the meeting who could not otherwise. *Second:* Where there are friends who can neither attend the meeting themselves, nor aid in sending a delegate thither, let them still remember that it is in their power to help the meeting, and that, by enclosing a donation (to yourself, Mr. Editor, or any other friend in New York), they can aid in defraying the unavoidably heavy expenses of a three days' meeting in New York on Anniversary week. These suggestions are made to every one of your readers, and to all who desire the progress and triumph of the principles of Anti-Slavery; and I am sure they will not be misunderstood by any such.

"Very respectfully, yours,

"—— —— —."

But if we ourselves are not alive to the importance of this meeting, the friends of chattel Slavery are, as witness the following 'Call' in the leader of the Herald of Tuesday morning.

The merchants, men of business, and men of property, in this city, should frown down the meetings of these mad people, if they would save themselves. What business have all the religious lunatics of the free States to gather in this commercial city for purposes, which, if carried into effect, would ruin and destroy its prosperity? Will the men of sense allow meetings to be held in this city, which are calculated to make our country the arena of blood and murder, and render our city an object of horror to the whole South? We hope not. Public opinion should be regulated. These Abolitionists should not be allowed to misrepresent New York. They are to hold a three days' meeting at the Tabernacle, commencing on May 7th. Tuesday morning next, at 10, A. M. Here is where all political factions can unite. All who are opposed to having our city disgraced, should go there, speak their views and prevent it. Let all of our honest citizens, who respect themselves, their wives, their mothers, their sisters and daughters, and, of course, the honor and dignity of the city in which they reside, go on Tuesday morning to the Tabernacle, and there look at the black and white brethren and sisters, fraternizing, slobbering over each other, speaking, praying, singing, blaspheming, and cursing the constitution of our glorious Union, and then say whether these things shall go forth to the South and the world, as the feeling of the great city of New York. Every citizen has a right, legally, and more than morally, to have his say at the amalgamation meeting on Tuesday. The Union expects every man to do his duty, and duty to the Union, and in the present crisis, points out to us that we should allow no more fuel to be placed upon the fire of abolitionism in our midst, when we can prevent it by sound reasoning and calm remonstrances.

We hope Mr. Bennett will follow his own advice. We doubt his power to stir up a mob, but if he should succeed in the purpose here indicated, we trust he will head it in person. There is no villainy of this sort ever perpetrated in this city that he has not much to do with it, and it would gratify us to be instrumental in having him lodged for once where he ought to be at all such times—in the Tombs with the ruffians from whom he differs only in this, that he has not their boldness to execute what he has the cunning to plan. He is, however, a good witness to the importance of this meeting, for his instinct, if he has no express commands from his masters and employers, advise him of a coming danger from which he has no safeguard but violence, poor as that is.

Daniel Webster and Massachusetts.

Massachusetts Resolutions are not always the safest guide to Massachutetts purpose, but there seems to be a meaning in the passage of the following series by both branches of her Legislature, carried through, as they were, since Mr. Webster 'recalled the State to her Constitutional duty.' That Senator himself is on a visit to Boston, and this declaration of the representatives of the people came upon him and his eight hundred "retainers,"—as the *Boston Courier* unwittingly calls them—about the time that he was assuring them from his carriage window at the door of the Revere House, that he should "support no agitations having their foundations in real ghostly abstractions." If the people sustain the sentiments of the present Legislature in the choice that is made of its successor, there will be a ghost of a United States Senator haunting the meadows of Marshfield. The Resolutions are as follows:

Whereas, The people of Massachusetts, acting under a solemn sense of duty, have deliberately and repeatedly avowed their purpose to resist the extension of Slavery into the National Territories, or the admission of new Slave States into the Union, and, for these ends, to apply, in every practical mode, the principles of the Ordinance of 1787; also, to seek the abolition of Slavery and the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia, and the withdrawal of the power and influence of the General Government from the support of Slavery, so far as the same may be Constitutionally done; and whereas, the important questions now before the country, make it desirable that these convictions should be reaffirmed; Therefore

Resolved, That the people of Massachusetts earnestly insist upon the application, by Congress, of the ordinance of 1787, with all possible sanctions and solemnities of law, to the Territorial possessions of the Union, in all parts of the continent, and for all coming time.

Resolved, That the people of Massachusetts cherish the Union with unabated attachment; that they will support the Constitution; that appreciating the inestimable benefits flowing from it, they believe it better for all parties and sections, with reference to any existing evils, to wait and work patiently under and through the Constitution. than to destroy it; and they have no doubt that they hold these sentiments in common with overwhelming majorities of the people of these United States; but, in any event, they will follow their principles, deterred by no threats of disunion, and no fear of consequences.

Resolved, That the integrity and permanence of American power on the Pacific Ocean, the increase of our commerce and wealth, the extension of our institutions, and the cause of human freedom on this continent, require the immediate admission of California into this Union, with her present Constitution, without reference to any other question or measure whatever.

Resolved, That the sentiments of the people of Massachusetts, as expressed in their legal enactments, in relation to the delivering up of fugitive slaves, remain unchanged; and, inasmuch as the legislation necessary to give effect to the clause of the Constitution, relating to this subject, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, we held it to be the duty of that body to pass such laws only, in regard thereto, as will be sustained by the public sentiment of the free States, where such laws are to be enforced, and which shall especially secure to all persons, whose surrender may be claimed, as having escaped from labor and service in other States, the right of having the validity of such claim determined by a jury in the State where such claim is made.

Resolved, That the people of Massachusetts, in the maintenance of these, their well known and invincible principles, expect that all their officers and representatives will adhere to them, at all times, on all occasions, and under all circumstances.

Resolved, That his Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to each of the Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts, in the Congress of the United States.

☞ As we look for a large delegation from various parts of the country to the approaching Anniversary, some persons who may have no fixed stopping place in the city may thank us for pointing out to them the advertisement of Mr. Powell, in another column. We understand from him that he can accommodate a considerable number of boarders, and that every possible arrangement will be made for the convenience of those who will be in attendance upon the meetings.

We are requested also by Mr. Powell to state that he intends to give a Breakfast, on Tuesday morning, for the benefit of the *North Star*, Frederick Douglass' paper. Tickets of admission, at 37 cents each, will be found for sale at this office, and at Mr. Powell's own house, 330 Pearl street, where the Breakfast will be given.

MR. SEWARD'S SPEECH.—It is a gratifying fact that, in addition to the ordinary Congressional edition of Mr. Seward's speech, another, handsomely printed and bound in pamphlet form, has also been issued at Washington, and extensively circulated all over the country. Beside these, another edition has been published in Boston, by Redding & Co., and many thousands of them put in circulation in Massachusetts. This last was published at the expense of one of the oldest, most respectable and wealthiest merchants of Boston, who, if recalled to any duty by Mr. Webster's Speech, was reminded to do this.

We are indebted to Redding & Co. for a copy of this edition, and to Mr. Seward for one of that last published at Washington.

HON. JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS passed through this city on Thursday, on his way to Ohio, for a brief visit to his family. He will not, as it has been announced he would, be in New York during Anniversary week

Domestic Correspondence.

From Our Boston Correspondent.

NO. LX.

THE ARGUMENT. *Happenings.—The two Websters. Nine days passed.—Possible Revival in one case.—Proposed Reception of Mr. Webster.—The Correspondent magnifieth the Occasion and himself.—Peculiar Pillory.—Proposed Proceedings.—Practical Piety.—Constitutional Consistency.—Constitutional Duties reduced to practice.—Programme.—The President of the Day.—Fitness of Choice.—The Procession.—The Proceedings.—Prayer, Address, Reply, Right Hand of Fellowship, Charge, Anthem and Benediction.—The Banquet.—Herpetologic Diet.—Supply and Demand.—Extinction of Toads. The new St. Patrick.—The Order of the Return to Washington.—The Scene in the Senate.—Moral Sublimity.—The Correspondent deprecateth criticism on his Prophetic character, and maketh a distinction between himself and his Boston fellows.—Decision of Supreme Court as to Colored Schools.—The New Hampshire Lawyer.—What must be done with this law.—Its logical consequences.—The Correspondent instructeth and threateneth the General Court, &c. &c. &c.*

BOSTON, April 27th, 1850.

Our happenings here have not been multitudinous since I wrote to you a fortnight ago. The two unhappy Websters still continue to occupy a good deal of what passes by the courtesy title of conversation. But the effect of the proverbial nine days is already beginning to be felt in regard to both of them. The flagging interest, however, may be revived a little next week in the case of the more recent offender, by the demonstration which his admirers propose making in his behalf. You may have seen it mentioned in the Boston papers that he is to be received in the square in front of the Revere House, which, it cannot be doubted, will be crowded; at least, there is one individual that will be *thar*. It cannot fail to be a truly historical occasion, and it were a thousand pities that a historian should not be on hand, especially when there is one of the incomparable qualifications of your Boston correspondent. I suppose one may indulge in the innocent recreation of seeing his fellow citizens make fools of themselves without becoming a partaker of their sins or their foolishness; at any rate, I do not intend to be deprived of the satisfaction of seeing Mr. Webster pilloried in front of the Revere House. This exhibition will be the more unique inasmuch as the criminal, at the same time that his own head is exposed, will nail most of those present also by the ears.

The arrangements have been made in the very happiest and most judicious manner. The eminent lawyers, learned and reverend professors, and other distinguished gentlemen who have been "recalled to a sense of their constitutional duties" by Mr. Webster's speech, you will be glad to hear, have not exhausted their newly awakened loyalty in the mere words of their address to him. They have been busy, ever since they made that public profession of Religion, in showing its vital influences, by reducing its precepts to practice. They have, accordingly, been diligent in hunting up the goods of our Southern brethren that have stolen themselves and made us the involuntary receivers. It is said that two of the signers, who stand at the head of the Massachusetts bar, seized Box Brown, one night, at his Mirror of Slavery, and hold him in their constitutional custody. Two reverend Fathers in our Israel, who shall be nameless, are said to have caught William and Ellen Craft, and to have them under lock and key on the Hill of Zion, "fast by the oracle of God." Betsey Blakeley is safe in the hands of an eminent Evangelical Divine of this city, who was also a signer. The hunt has been as thorough and as effectual as that of the rat catchers of Paris, so that it is said that there is a runaway *nigger* for every signer of the letter locked up in their respective coal cellars at this moment. These are to be disposed of as you will presently hear.

The Programme of the Reception I understand to be as follows. JOHN H. PEARSON, Esq., has, with great delicacy and propriety, been selected as the presiding officer of the occasion. This was a compliment no more than the due of that patriotic gentleman who did not need to be "recalled to a sense of his Constitutional obligations" by Mr. Webster, but was perfectly clear about them when these others were in outer darkness, and not only so, but carried them into effect, at the risk of being at this moment hammering stone for the public good in the service of the State at Charlestown. The Procession will be formed either at Faneuil Hall or in Liberty Square, and thence proceed in this order to the Revere House; first, two Signers of the Webster Letter, then two fugitive slaves hand-cuffed together, and so on alternately throughout. I might give you an account of the various banners borne by the clerical, legal, mercantile and miscellaneous portions of the procession, respectively; but I must be brief. Upon arriving on the ground the procession will form in a hollow square, with the slaves in the centre, and, after the President has taken his chair, the Throne of Grace will be addressed by the Rev. LEONGERRY AUSTIN, Esq., who distinguished himself by ARD WOODS, D. D., of Andover. Then ELBRIDGE his efforts in behalf of the Constitutional Rights of James B. Gray, of Norfolk, Va., to his Slave Latimer, in October, 1842, will welcome Mr. Webster to Boston, and deliver over to him in the name of Boston and its purlieus the magnificent Testimonial collected by the patriotism and piety of his converts, as an evidence of their devotion to the Union.

Mr. Webster will, of course, reply in a manner worthy of himself and of the Occasion, and accept the temporary trust reposed in him, as the crowning glory of his public life. After he has finished, the Right Hand of Fellowship will be extended to him by the Rev. RALPH EMERSON, of Andover Theological Seminary, to be followed by the Charge, by Professor MOSES STUART, of the same Institution, The Congregation will then unite in singing "*Hail Columbia*," after which the Benediction will be pronounced by the Rev. WILLIAM M. ROGERS, of the Winter Street Church. After the services are over, a magnificent banquet will be served up to those who shall take part in them by the landlord of the Revere House. This skilful caterer has spared neither pains nor expense to make this a Feast fit to crown such a work. The dishes will mainly consist of that delicacy in which Northern Statesmen and their admirers chiefly delight; the capacity for the deglutition of which, indeed, is what guages the "Statesmanship" of our great men of the North. I need hardly say that I refer to that valuable description of esculent animals known to the learned as belonging to the Genus *Rana* and the Species *Bufo*, which the Witches in Macbeth invoke by the name of Paddock, but which the common people vulgarly denominate *Toads*. It is affirmed that the demand has been so unprecedented that there is danger of the race becoming extinct in this part of New England. Mr. Webster, who, though he has recently joined the Episcopal Church, is generally regarded as *no Saint*, may thus become the rival of St. Patrick himself in the miraculous extermination of reptiles. It is reported (but the rumor may be without foundation) that Professor Agassiz has offered as much as fifty dollars for a specimen, but without success.

During Mr. Webster's visit to Marshfield, the Black Testimonial will be kept securely, so as to be in readiness against his return to Washington. Then he and it will be attended by the Signers, and escorted by the Boston Brigade to the depot, whence he will proceed, with his gifts of ebony, by special trains, to the Capital of this Happy Country. There the Testimonial will be lodged in the National Treasure-house provided by this great Nation for the safe-keeping of her jewels in this kind, until it can be dispersed among its lawful proprietors in the various portions of our Glorious Union. A more touching proof of a returning sense of Constitutional Duty—a more affecting tribute to the wounded sensibilities of the Southern brethren—can hardly be imagined. It cannot fail to pour balm upon the wounds which Fanaticism has inflicted on those fraternal hearts. It is proposed that Mr. Webster, in his place in the Senate, after reciting this sublime instance of Repentance on the part of his constituents, shall present the key of the casket containing the restored gems to Mr. Foote, as the Representative of the South. The two plenipotentiaries will then embrace, as a symbol of the blessed Reconciliation of the two sections, and seal it with a Holy kiss. I will venture to predict that there will not be a dry eye in the gallery, aye, or on the floor either, that day.

As this letter must be written and despatched before the scene above anticipated has been presented, it is not impossible that there may be some inconsiderable deviations from the course of proceeding here laid down. You may find, when you come to read the doings, that material changes have been adopted. I have no control over the arrangements, and by no means pledge my veracity that they will be precisely as I have expressed them. I can only say that I cannot conceive of any other fitting embodiment of the entire approval of all Mr. Webster's Speech by his (not your) Boston Correspondents. If you should chance to find that I am misinformed in any particulars, I beg you will lay the blame on the inconsistency of the Signers of the Boston Letter to Mr. Webster, and find no fault with the natural propriety and logical necessity of such an Order of Performances as I have indicated. And so if you should discover, as is barely possible, my information as to their prompt discharge of their Constitutional duties, in the seizure of the fugitives as above, to be in any particular erroneous, for pity's sake don't condemn me for being ready to think better of them than they deserve.

I believe you mentioned, last week, the fact of the decision of the Supreme Court here affirming the right of School Committees to establish separate schools for colored children. There was no intimation by the Chief Justice that this opinion was not unanimous, though it is strange that it should have been, inasmuch as one of the puisne Judges (Mr. Justice Fletcher), when at the Bar, had given a strong and well-reasoned opinion diametrically opposed to this. I have no time to enter into the merits of this Decision. I will not say as the leader for many years of the New Hampshire Bar used to say, with an inimitable nasal twang, when he happened to hold a different opinion from the Court, "'*T'aint Law!*" But if it be law, it is law which it behooves the Legislature to rectify by Statute as soon as possible. It gives the School Committees the power of making distinctions which are no where recognized in the Law of Massachusetts. Such distinctions as rest upon difference of age and of sex have analogical types in the Laws of the State; but such as are marked by color have no such precedent or analogy. By the same ruling, the Committees might erect separate schools for Rich and Poor, for Orthodox and Heterodox, for Red-haired and Black-haired. Massachusetts is far enough from being what she should be; but I do not believe that she will permit this anomaly in her jurisprudence to exist for the single benefit of Boston; for Boston, as you know, is the only place in the State where such a distinction is permitted. At any rate, the believers in the equal rights of citizens will give the Legislature a chance to correct this matter, next year, and so on continually till it is done.

D. Y.

Communications.

FUGITIVE SLAVES IN ENGLAND IN 1729, AND IN AMERICA IN 1850.

DEAR MR. GAY:—The following extract from that invaluable work, Clarkson's History of the Abolition of the Slave Trade, is so instructive at the present moment, points so directly and forcibly at dangers which are gathering about the victims of the system of Slavery in our own land, and shows so plainly that Slavery has found [or purchased?] distinguished legal advocates and defenders in other times besides ours, that I am led to hope you will give it an early insertion in the *Standard*—a journal, permit me to add, which would have one hundred thousand subscribers in the United States, if its merits as a full and authentic repository of the most important Anti-Slavery documents, speeches, &c., and as an able, fearless defender of the Anti-Slavery cause, were known and fitly understood.

"About this time certain cruel and wicked practices, which must now be mentioned, had arrived at such a height, and had become so frequent in the metropolis [London], as to produce of themselves other coadjutors to the cause.

"Before the year 1700, planters, merchants, and others, resident in the West Indies, but coming to England, were accustomed to bring with them certain slaves to act as servants with them during their stay. The latter, seeing the freedom and the happiness of servants in this country, and considering what would be their own hard fate on their return to the islands, frequently absconded. Their masters of course made search after them, and often had them seized and carried away by force. It was, however, thrown out by many on these occasions, that the English laws did not sanction such proceedings, for that all persons who were baptized became free. The consequence of this was, that most of the slaves, who came over with their masters, prevailed upon some pious clergyman to baptize them. They took of course godfathers of such citizens as had the generosity to espouse their cause. When they were seized they usually sent to these, if they had an opportunity, for their protection. And in the result, their godfathers, maintaining that they had been baptized, and that they were free on this account as well as by the general tenor of the law of England, dared those who had taken possession of them to send them out of the kingdom.

"The planters, merchants, and others, being thus circumstanced, knew not what to do. They were afraid of taking their slaves away by force, and they were equally afraid of bringing any of the cases before a public court. In this dilemma, in 1729, they applied to York and Talbot, the attorney and solicitor-general for the time being, and obtained the following strange opinion from them:—"We are of opinion, that a slave by coming from the West Indies into Great Britain or Ireland, either with or without his master, does not become free, and that his master's right and property in him is not thereby determined [*i. e.* terminated] or varied, and that baptism doth not bestow freedom on him, nor make any alteration in his temporal condition in these kingdoms. We are also of opinion, that the master may legally compel him to return again to the plantations."

"This cruel and illegal opinion was delivered in the year 1729. The planters, merchants, and others, gave it of course all the publicity in their power. And the consequences were, as might easily have been apprehended, *in a little time, slaves absconding were advertised in the London papers as runaways*, and rewards offered for the apprehension of them, in the same brutal manner as we find them advertised in the land of Slavery. *They were advertised, also, in the same papers, to be sold by auction*, sometimes by themselves, and at others with horses, chaises, and harness! *They were seized also by their masters, or by persons employed by them, in the very streets, and dragged from thence to the ships;* and so unprotected now were these poor slaves, that *persons in no wise concerned with them, began to institute a trade in their persons*, making agreements with captains of ships going to the West Indies to put them on board at a certain price. This last instance shows, * * * as all history does from the time of Joseph, that WHERE THERE IS A MARKET FOR THE PERSONS OF HUMAN BEINGS, ALL KINDS OF ENORMITIES WILL BE PRACTISED TO OBTAIN THEM."

It were easy, by the substitution of a few names for those used above, to give these paragraphs a close application to our country and time. For *York* and *Talbot*, we might read *Foote* and *Webster*; for West Indies and Great Britain, read Slave States and Free States; for *these kingdoms*, we should read *this free, Christian Republic!* for *London papers*, we might read New York papers, Boston papers, Cincinnati papers, in the almost entire certainty that, if not literally true today, it will be true to-morrow, or the next day, or just as soon as Messrs. Mason, Foote, Dickinson, Cass, Webster, &c. &c. can adjust the terms of the bargain. For, Mr. Editor, look with me and see how "coming events cast their shadows before"—shadows black and dismal as those of Tartarus itself. Look at the preparation which the ready Northern vassals of the slaveholder are making for commencing the slave trade between the Free (!) and the Slave States. I give two paragraphs which I have this day taken from recent journals:

FUGITIVE SLAVES.—The Pennsylvania House of Representatives, by a vote of 50 to 27, has passed a bill repealing certain objectionable sections of the law of 1847, to prevent the recovery of fugitive slaves.

"Objectionable sections!" *Objectionable* to whom? To the wearied, panting, half-dead victim of worse than Austrian oppression a hundred times multiplied? or to his blood-thirsty pursuer?

Once more:

A SLAVE HUNTER IN BOSTON.—A slave hunter from Macon, Ga., named Gunn, is prowling around Boston to ascertain the whereabouts of escaped slaves. Last Wednesday week, he called upon Ellen Crafts, who knew him well, to make inquiries about some one who had escaped from bondage. The fugitives in Boston had better be on the look out at this time.

We need not reiterate this caution to the fugitives *everywhere*, and their friends (thank God, these are not few;) for their own instincts will teach them this. But we would exhort them all to prepare, as one man, for the just and holy contest which is to be waged with the powers of darkness. LET THEM BE TRUE, and there is no room for doubt where the *victory* will be.

M.

Worcester County, Mass.

General Intelligence.

The Greenfield Democrat says the following note, *verbatim et literatim*, was sent to the presiding judge of a court in that county, recently:—

to the Honorable cort
Sir your juris canter Gree.

fonrman.

——The *Boston Daily Advertiser* is authorized to state that a report which has obtained considerable currency in the newspapers, that Mr. Edward Everett is engaged in the preperation of a history of France, is without foundation.

——Mr. Horace Mann addressed his friends and neighbors at West Newton, March 22d, on the present condition of things at Washington His speech was strongly anti-slavery in its character.

——The statue of Eve sculptured by Powers, for Mr. Preston, of South Carolina, and considered to be his master piece, was recently lost on the Spanish Coast, by the wreck of the vessel, on board of which it was placed for transit to this country.

——PHOSPHORIC MATCHES have produced in the workmen employed in their preparatiou diseases of the jaw bones, which have sometimes destroyed life, and often occasioned the loss of the bones.—*Bali. Sun*

——FATHER MATHEW.—A number of gentlemen friendly to that great moral lever, the cause of Temperence, and desirous of evincing to its great and successful champion, Father Mathew, a testimony of their approbation for his praiseworthy course, formed themselves into a collecting committee; and having each, in his sphere, performed his duty the proceeds, *seven hundred and sixty dollars*, were presented to Father Mathew last Sunday morning.—*New. O. Delta.*

——THOM, THE SCULPTOR.—The newspapers have already announced the death of James Thom, who expired at his lodgings in this city on the 17th instant. He was generally well known as the author of those pieces of stone statuary, called Tam O'Shanter and Souter Johnny, which several years ago were exhibited in most of the States of the United Statet. He was a native of Ayrshire, in Scotland, but came to this country some fourteen years ago in pursuit of a runaway debtor, from whom he recovered his money, and then settled near Patterson, New Jersey.

——RAILROAD LIABILITY—The Supreme Court have decided, in the care of Morena Jordan vs. Fall River Railroad that the Company is liable for a trunk lost or stolen, and for such valuable articles contained in it as may be considered connected with personal apparel, such as a watch and chain, and for so much money as may be considered necessary to the traveller for travelling expenses, but not for large sums of money or merchandise thus carried, unless specially notified.—*Boston Post.*

——BAPTIST BIBLE.—A spirited controversy is going on in the papers of the Baptist denomination, in regard to the proposed publication of an edition of the Bible by the American and Foreign Bible Society, with the word *baptized* and its cognates translated *immerse*, &c.

——The last publication of the bans of marriage in Massachusetts took place on the 22d.—the law requiring that form, having been abolished. It was in the case of a black man, who declared his intention to marry a white woman.

——ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.—This body convened at the Vine Street Congregational Church, yesterday morning. Samuel Lewis of our city was called to the chair, and presided until the regular organization. The business of the forenoon session was mostly the appointment of Committees and the division of exercises. In the afternoon the regular elections were held, and Judge Stevens, of Indiana, was chosen President of the Convention. Six Vice Presidents and four Secretaries were elected. The Committee on Resolutions, of which Dr. Brisbane is Chairman, made a report, in which high ground is taken against slavery and slaveholders—ground which agrees well with Senator Seward's late speech in Congress. These resolutions will probably be discussed to-day.

The Convention is ecclesiastical in its character, and its action will be mainly upon Church matters in their relation to anti-slavery sentiment. Tobacco chewers may leave their quids at home when they visit the Convention, as the spittoons are all removed according to "notice," and no applauding of any character is to be allowed. The sessions of the Convention are all to be opened with prayer. The evening meetings will be addressed by members of the Convention, on topics of a general bearing upon the questions discussed in the Convention. Rev. C. B. Boynton lectured last evening.—*Cincinnati Gazette*

——The family of President TAYLOR, says the *Newport News*, have engaged a suite of rooms for their use at that pleasant resort during the Summer.

——The price for telegraphic correspondence is to be reduced on the Morse line between New York and Boston, and Portland, on and after May 1st, to less than half the previous rates.

——The examination of Dr. J. H. Smith, at Saco, MAIN, on charge of causing the death of the unfortunate girl found in the drain, has resulted in the committal of the accused for trial.

——George S. Hillard, of Boston, says the Evening Post, illuminated his late speech in defence of Mr. Webster, in the Legislature of Massachusetts, with the following sentence:

"This clamorous and blatant zeal in behalf of the liberty of the press is as preposterous as a cry of fire would have been in the middle of Noah's flood."

In a speech delivered in the House of Lords by Lord Brougham, on the Roman Catholic claims, he said:

"It is a remark often quoted of Dr. Johnson, that he who could entertain serious apprehensions of danger to the church in these times, would have cried 'fire' during the deluge."

——STATE CONVENTION OF THE LIBERTY PARTY.—A Convention of the Liberty Party of the State of New-York will be held at the city of Syracuse on Wednesday and Thursday, the 3d and 4th days of July next, for the purpose of considering and discussing their duties in the present interesting state of public affairs. Also, to perfect State organization, and make a nomination of State officers, to be supported at the Fall election, if it is thought best, then, to make nominations.

——Rev. J. T. Sargent has been compelled, by continued ill health, to resign his charge of the South Universalist Society in this city, and will sail for Europe in the next steamer (the America) from this port on the 1st of May.—*Boston Transcript.*

——SLAVERY.—The people of the South have taxed their wits in endeavoring to find some word or term for *Negro Slavery* that will fully express the meaning and at the same time avoid the odious sound of that word *Slavery*. It has all been in vain—they have not yet found the word The discovery, however, has been made, and the South is laid under many obligations to the *North Pennsylvanian* for having having made it. It speaks after this manner.

"They (the people of the South) declare that they will hold him in a state or condition of *perpetual apprenticeship;* such as he was in when they received him from their fathers. We use this term *perpetual apprenticeship*,, for after all the sublimated and sickly cant about Southern Slavery—this is what it really is."

"*Perpetual apprenticeship!*" Very modest expression indeed. According to Mrs. Swishelm, then *perpetual apprenticeship* consists in the right to "horsewhip a woman and sell her baby."—*Bradford (Penn.) Argus.*

——CAN SLAVERY GO INTO CALIFORNIA?—Two men were seen at San Jose, according to the *Alta California*, in sharp contest. The white beat the black, and cries of shame were heard, when the master was taken in custody.

Soon the parties were brought before the Alcade.

The white man, at first, set the court at defiance. But he was sobered down, when he made the following statement:

"*That negro is my slave: I brought him from home with me. He has been among the free negroes of the town, getting drunk and doing as he pleased I made up my mind to leave town this evening, and determined to take him along with me.* I met him in the street, and told him he must go. This he refused to do. I then leaned down to take up a stick to chastise him, when he seized me and flung me down. I then broke a stick over his head, which I had a right to do. *He is my property, and I intend to have him, and give him a good two hundred lashes in the bargain.*"

The court yielded. The slave had been brought into California before the Constitution was formed, and upon that ground he was ordered to jail to await his master's orders. In the meantime he was ordered to be publicly scourged.

A writ of habeas corpus was granted afterwards, by Judge Bennet, *but it was ascertained that the negro had been delivered to his master, and there the matter ended.*

This man is now a slave, and is likely to remain so, notwithstanding the Mexican laws, about the omnipotence of which Mr. Benton speaks with such confidence, and notwithstanding the will of God in favor of freedom in California, which Mr. Webster thinks it would be mere trifling for Congress to re-enact.

Should California be denied admission to the Union this summer, and the Slavery interest be permitted to triumph in consequence of the Anti-Slavery clause in her constitution, the Pacific territory would swarm with cases just like this.

A slave is induced to accompany his master from the States, by promises of enfranchisement after a brief period of service. Encouraged by this promise, and relying upon its being kept in good faith, they go with him, and remain faithful to his service. If public sentiment and the law make it necessary, the master will, in turn, be faithful to his promise, but if not, if there is any encouragement to hope that his tyranny will go unwhipt of justice, in nine cases out of ten the fate of the slave will be just as inexorable upon the shores of the Yuba, as among the cane brakes of Louisiana, or in the cotton bottoms of Alabama.

A Havana correspondent of the *Cincinnati Enquirer* makes the following statement to that journal:—

"On our vessel are quite a number from Kentucky, several taking with them slaves under an agreement to give them their freedom for two years' services in the mines. Will the slaves adhere to the contract? They will. They are honest, and will not violate their word; they had opportunities to leave on the Indiana shore; every inducement was offered at Evansville and other places for them to leave—they resisted all. And then they leave behind families for whom they have the same interest that we have for ours, whose freedom they expect in time to purchase."

How can any one have patience any longer with the fashionable twaddle of cowardly politicians about the inutility of prohibitory laws against Slavery in the new territories?—*Eve. Post.*

——CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN MASSACHUSETTS—The following is a bill introduced into the Massachusetts Senate by Mr. Amasa Walker. If adopted it will doubtless save both Pierson and Dr. Webster, now under sentence of death from the gallows:

SEC. 1. When any person shall be convicted of any crime punishable with death, and sentenced to such punishment, he shall at the same time, be sentenced to hard labor in the State Prison, until such punishment of death shall be inflicted.

SEC. 2. And no person so imprisoned, shall be executed in pursuance of such sentence within one year from the day such sentence of death was passed, nor until the whole record of such proceedings, or case, shall be certified by the clerk of said court, under the seal thereof, to the Supreme Executive authority of the State, nor until a warrant shall be issued by said Executive authority, under the great seal of the State, directed to the Sheriff of the county wherein the State Prison is situated, commanding the Sheriff to cause the sentence of death to be carried into execution.

SEC. 3. Any person under sentence of death, at the time of the passing of this act, shall be committed to the State Prison, there to be confined at hard labor until the expiration of one year from the time of his sentence, and until the sentence of death shall be executed; and the Governor shall issue his warrant, authorizing and requiring such commitment.

A law similar to the above has been several years on the statute books of Maine, during which no execution has taken place.

——Mr. Webster (says the *Evening Post*) could talk bravely once about the cringing and treacherous subserviency of the north to the slaveholders. The following passage, from his famous Marshfield speech, is quoted by a whig print, the *Providence Journal*, by way of comment on his own recent course in the Senate:

"And now they—the gentlemen at Buffalo—talk about the dictation of the slave power. *They* talk of it. I don't. They talk of the triumph of the South over the North—There is not one word of truth in it. I say upon my conscience, that evil as the influence of the slave institution is, the North has borne her full share and part in that evil. Northern votes have been given for every instance of projected slave increase. And, gentlemen, we talk of the North, but there has been no North, at least for years past. I think the North star has at last been discovered, but up to the close of the last session of Congress there has been no North.

"We have read in Pope:

'Ask where's the North—at York 'tis on the Tweed,
In Scotland at the Orcades and there,
At Greenland, Zembla, or the Lord knows where.'

"And if it is meant to inquire, 'Where is the North?' if by the North is indicated a firm, solid, substantial resistance to the extension of Slavery—if any such place ever existed, it was—the Lord knows where. I do not.

——LIQUOR IN MASSACHUSETTS.—The Legislature of Massachusetts has passed an act somewhat increasing the stringency of the enactments heretofore existing against the sale of intoxicating liquors except for Medical purposes. The Senate bill was concurred in on Tuesday by the House—Yeas 171; Nays 50; Absent 74. No doubt of Gov. Briggs's signature.

The provisions of this bill engraft upon the present law the word "intoxicating" instead of "spirituous" liquors, which may not be sold at retail without license—allow County Commissioners to license the sale of less than twenty-eight gallons at a time for medicinal and mechanical purposes—while at present the Commissioners cannot give anything but a general license to sell for any occasion; and they punish infractions of the present statute by obliging those who violate it to give security, after a third conviction, in a sum not less than $100 and not more than $1,000 that they will obey the State law thereafter.

——FUGITIVE SLAVES.—Several slaves having escaped into Ohio the early part of this month, from Little Kanawha, Virginia, there has since been a renewal of bad feeling between the river counties on both sides of the river. The Parkersburg *Gazette* accuses a number of citizens of Harmer and Marietta, Ohio, six of whom it names, of assisting the fugitives to get away from their masters. This accusation is repelled by the Marietta *Intelligencer*—after inquiry so far as one of the persons mentioned is concerned, and from general understanding so far as most of the others are concerned. The editor admits that one of the men, who was formally a citizen of Wood county, Va., which he was compelled to leave because he once sang at a wedding party a song in which Slavery was referred to, *may* have helped the slaves to get out of the State, in a spirit of revenge; but, beyond this, says that "they escaped without foreign aid." In the following remarks, the *Intelligencer* indicates what always has been the feeling in all that part of Ohio, with reference to fugitive slaves; and this feeling, we apprehend, will long continue, notwithstanding what Mr. Webster or anybody else may say about "the compromises of the Constitution," and the obligations springing therefrom.

"When once in a free State, the number of men who will aid in re-capturing slaves is small indeed. Is there any law compelling men to engage in this service? *Not yet*, we believe. One fact more. The number of men on this side the river who aid slaves in efforts to escape is very small—much smaller than is generally supposed. Our people will have nothing to do, in any way, with the business. With very few exceptions their "hands are off"—as well in regard to the escape of slaves as their re-capture. If slaves will run away, it's none of our business, and if their masters will recapture them, there are but few who will throw obstacles in the way—provided legal steps are taken to do it. Those who do interfere against the masters must be proceeded against legally."

He who attempts to go farther than this, will have a tide of popular sentiment to stem in Ohio, which will be very apt to bear his feet from under him. To laws enacted by the Congress of the United States in furtherance of the constitutional provision for the reclamation of runaway slaves, to be executed by United States officers and their deputies, the people of Ohio will submit, while such laws are not abused and made the instruments of protecting kidnappers, and of carrying into Slavery persons who are *not* fugitives. But they will never consent, in deference to State or National law either, to have their sympathies dammed up; and their lips padlocked, and their arms bound to their sides, and in this condition be compelled to stand as a sort of half-animate wall along the northern border of Virginia and Kentucky, to prevent the slaves of those States from escaping from perpetual bondage. All that can be expected of them, and the most that it will be wise or safe to ask, is, that they will *permit*, not that they will *do*: that they will stand quietly by while United States officers execute process, in proper form; not that they will take hold and execute it themselves.

Four of the slaves, whose escape has revived the bad feeling referred to, were men (*men*? no! *males*) belonging to Turnur Boulwar; the other three were a mother and her two children, belonging to Thomas Tavenner.—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS,

For the Standard, from April 1, to May 1, 1850.

577	David Irish, Quaker Hill, N. Y.	$2 00
565

Poetry.

From the New-York Tribune.

THE FUGITIVE.

BY MONOGRAPH.

"No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any laws or regulations therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service is due."—*Constitution of the United States, Art.* iii, *Sec.* 2.

THE North Star beamed with a radiant light,
As it watched 'mid the countless spheres,
And the strong ray fell on the blue of night,
As it did in the golden years;
Down on the shore of this star-lit sea—
The outlined verge of the dusky Earth—
There floated the spirits, pure and free,
That called the Auroral Lights to birth.

They rustled their robes and the orient flush
Was pencilling beams on the arching sky,
And the rainbow seemed with electric rush
In a thousand flashes swift to fly,
Till the thin veil hung o'er the Milky Way.
And the whispering spirits breathed afar,
While they lingered on high till the dawn of day,
Then slept in the watch of the Northern Star.

Down in the home of the sunny clime,
In the everglade gloom of his cheerless soul,
A tear-dimmed eye, that looked for the time
Of his broken chain, saw the North Star roll;
And the light flashed in on his doubt and gloom,
And the tear dried up on his sunburnt cheek,
For he heard such a star would his path illume,
To the freeman's home if he would but seek.

So he knelt him down where the tall cane grows,
And he vowed that night that he would be free,
And he prayed to Heaven and he proudly rose
From the vow and prayer on his suppliant knee;
'T was the land of his birth—but he stood alone—
His wife and his children—where were they?
To the far land borne, and their parting tone
Was the requiem of hope as they passed away.

The star shone forth with a radiant light,
As he sped, hard-pressed, for the land he sought,
And he lurked by day, but he ran by night,
Till he reached the land of his holy thought;
The cloud passed on from his saddened brow,
Sang the birds in a sweeter strain,
For the sun rose up on a freeman now,
And he loosed him there of the bondman's chain

And a crystal stream he knelt beside
With a freeman's vow on a freeman's tongue,
While he gaily walked in a freeman's pride,
And a freeman's joyous song he sung;
With a heart of Hope, and the hand of toil,
In the new life now he had just begun,
With a faith in man, and an uncursed soil,
He sprang to his task with the rising sun.

But the chains reforged for his healing limbs
In a Freeman's hand to his home were borne,
For the trade-bond old which our light bedims
On the Freeman's altar once was sworn;
And the Northman spoke in the deadening ears,
The Northman's chains met his tear-filled eyes,
And the words of doom chilled his soul with fears,
And the shackles clanked 'mid his hopeless sighs.

The North Star paled to a feeble light,
And a dark cloud shrouded the starry spheres,
While the gloom of a drear and rayless night,
And the large rain spoke of a world in tears;
To the land of his birth where he stood alone,
With a stronger bond he was carried then,
And the branded bondman was never known
To look at the bright North Star again.

New-York, March 12, 1850.

From the [London] Examiner.

LINES BY W. S. LANDOR.

Again, perhaps and only once again,
I turn my steps to London. Few the scenes
And few the friends that there delighted me
Will now delight me: some indeed remain,
Tho' changed in features....friend and scene....both changed!
I shall not watch my lilac burst her bud
In that wide garden, that pure fount of air,
Where, risen ere the morns are warm and bright,
And stepping forth in very scant attire,
Timidly, as became her in such garb,
She hastened prompt to call up slumbering spring.
White and dim-purple breath'd my favorite pair
Under thy terrace, hospitable heart,
Whom twenty summers more and more endear'd;
Part on the Arno, part where every clime
Sent its most graceful sons, to kiss thy hand,
To make the humble proud, the proud submiss,
Wiser the wisest, and the brave more brave.
Never, ah, never now, shall we alight
Where the man-queen was born, or, higher up
The nobler region of a nobler soul,
Where breathed his last the more than kingly man.
Thou sleepest, not forgotten, nor unmourn'd,
Beneath the chestnut shade by Saint Germain;
Meanwhile I wait the hour of my repose,
Not under Italy's serener sky,
Where Fiesole beheld me from above
Devising how my head most pleasantly
Might rest ere long, and how with such intent
I smooth'd a platform for my villagers
(Tho' stood against me stubborn stony knoll
With cross-grain'd olives long confederate),
And brought together slender cypresses
And bridal myrtles, peering up between,
And bade the modest violet bear her part.
Dance, youths and maidens! tho' around my grave
Ye dance not, as I wish: bloom, myrtles! bend
Protecting arms about them, cypresses!
I must not come among you; fare ye well!

FROM GOETHE.

Ask not thou what gate unclosing
Into God's fair city let thee;
Tranquil bow to his disposing,
Take the place that he hath set thee.

Sages, Heroes, there commanding;
Serve thou them, and they will serve thee.
Those will give thee understanding,
These for action steel and nerve thee.

If, nor sluggish nor elated,
Thou hast onward faithful wended,
Know! by none shalt thou be hated,
But by many be befriended.

And the Ruler recognizes
Whatsoe'er thou workest truly.
One who faithful effort prizes
Will reward thee for it duly.

A STORM.

But now she drew nigh to the river again
And the wood of moss'd birches so old;
While black over Stanage, with hail and with rain,
A tempest of April was rolled;
Right and left, like a shaft-broken arrow of doom,
Unheard its red lightning was sent;
And, Up! the broad curtain of fire-lifted gloom,
From the summit, at intervals went;
Like many-tailed snakes, with their heads on the ground,
And their many tails pendant in air,
In skeleton grimness, the ag'd trees around,
From the region of storms, and its black western mound,
Lean'd motionless, silent, and bare.
But her heart heard no voice when the damp hollow wind
Through their dry branches drearily moan'd;
Nor felt she his touch, when it wetted each rind,
And the fast-coming thunder-cloud groan'd.

—From "The Gipsey," by Ebenezer Elliot.

Miscellany.

A VISIT TO LEIGH HUNT.

HE lives in one of the quiet, elegant squares that have gradually been forming all around the delightful neighborhood of Kensington Park. After I had sat down for a few minutes in his library—conning the books as I had often done before, but always do with renewed interest—the door briskly opens, and in trips Leigh Hunt—in look, figure, and manner, the "Immortal Boy!" as his friends have named him, quoting a fine expression from his own poetry. It has often been remarked, that one has always some previous image of such a man; and that frequently this image is somewhat roughly dissipated by the reality. But Leigh Hunt in imagination, and Leigh Hunt in bodily presence, are much the same creature—light, brilliant, expressive—in constant elastic motion, palpitation it may be called, yet not easy or precipitate, but serene and bright, with a perennial flow of cheerfulness! profound sympathies at the same time ever mingling with the most tender or joyous impressions—and a free-growing, half-careless, natural grace all about him, as if born of the same spirit which wreathes

The sweet briar or the vine,
Or the twisted eglantine.

His appearance—especially when animated by any incident or impulse, which was the case when Timothy, some years ago caught the first glimpse of him, is exceedingly fine, with much of that uniqueness and fascination with which Nature, often even externally, clothes her favorites. After the first instantaneous survey, your attention is particularly rivetted by the forehead and eyes, and by the quick, constant youthful play of his movements. More beautiful eyes cannot be conceived; they seem to be the very perfections of those orbs of the soul. They are dark, large, brilliant, finely penetrating, but without one spark of fierceness, anger, pride, or any tumultuous passions; nay, they are as sweet as they are strong, as mild as they are bright, radiant, with inspiration, suffused with thoughtfulness and wisdom, but habitually soft with kindness, with goodness, with gay-glancing wit which irradiates but does not wound, and, at moments, deeply saddened into an expression of pensiveness and pity. The forehead embowers up from the eyes with singular grace and beauty—not, perhaps, massive or majestic—for the whole mould of the man is light, refined, delicate—but it is full, compact, finely rounded, and most expressive, not only of fancy and elegance, but of force, decision, and active working power, both in intellect and character. His hair, which has been dark, but is now whitening, is neatly parted, and flows to a considerable length, but with modest grace, a little way over his shoulders. No part of his body ever seems to rest; but this is not the fidgetiness of old age, or any uneasy irritability of temperament; it is the downright overflowing, unconfinable joyance and buoyancy of *youth*, that are within him fresh and strong as ever. Even seated in his chair, all the "immortal boy" reveals itself in him. These shoulders will be shrugging and twisting, these legs will be cutting quaint capers, these sharp feet will be darting out, these fingers will be touching some book, some pen, or tapping some friend on the shoulder or breast, or, for very excess of playfulness, be twirling in all shapes round and through each other. Then what a gladness comes over him, if you want anything—if he can only persuade you to have something, whatever it be, a book, a picture, another chair, a bit of biscuit, a cup of tea with him,—what an opportunity for the "immortal boy" to start up on those throbbing limbs,—to frisk and bound here and there; and in every quick look and rapid-changing gesture, to express the very intensity of delight, of sympathy, of enjoyment! In all this there is no eccentricity, no frivolity, but a gushing joyousness, youthfulness and warmth of heart, which enliven even the most torpid, sensibly raise the temperature of the most cynical, make the indifferent his friends, and attach his friends still more and more to him. How it especially captivates the amiable and accomplished among the young themselves, need not be said.

Although spiritually speaking, an "immortal boy," he complains that sad *conventionality*, old age, will be creeping upon him. He said—"I have always at all seasons wooed the air, whether she might be all smiles as in the full-blown Spring, or in the dumps as she gets in Autumn. Down to last year, I never experienced any harm from this exposure; but one day last Winter I went out as usual—a little showery, but not a hard rain—I had not proceeded many yards, till I felt a gigantic steel hand lay hold of me, from the nape of the neck down to the sole of the foot. I knew who that was: I asked him no questions, but returned to the house as fast as I could. All the rest of the Winter I kept to a room up stairs, never left it, and manufactured a kind of *demi-tropical* region for myself. People said it was a severe Winter, but I managed to be pretty snug." But this advance of old age, of which he complains, is making little visible trace on the outer man, which is about as elastic as ever, and none upon the mind, for his very latest productions are among the ripest and most delicious of all the fruits of his genius. Besides the large number of interesting and highly popular prose works which he has lately given to the public he has for some short time past been engaged in moulding a series of small poems, of a very select and highly finished character. The following is the *idea* which they are meant to carry out. He says—"I have a number of old, tried, peculiar friends, on whom, during my more personal meditations, my mind often turns. I should like so much to have neat little cabinet pictures of them hung all about my room. Well, I can't accomplish that, but it struck me, this I could do. All these friends had each some favorite story—some little corner of humanity, which has a peculiar, perhaps nameless charm to them. So, I said to myself, I shall endeavor from time to time to embody and concentrate these stories into short poems, as carefully wrought and thoroughly compacted as I can make them; and preface them with some little inscriptions to the particular friend, to whom I know the story to be a favorite, or at least to be especially suited. I shall then, as it were, have myself all hung round with cabinet poems." The genius here displayed is not more admirable than the affectionate, impulsive nature of the man. A number of these pieces have been finished; and I know they have commanded the admiration of some of the finest scholars and critics of the day. I have always considered this the form of poetry in which Leigh Hunt excelled most—indeed in which he is unrivaled.

He has an extensive and accurate knowledge of Scotch poetry, and considers it, though limited in its forms, to be in its character a body of as perfect poetry, as any country can possess. The old ballads he recites with as much enthusiasm as if he were an ancient minstrel who had re-appeared upon the scene; and his Scotch pronunciation, in reading, is often as good a- anything Nithsdale could turn out. I have often heard him give with all the *birr* of an old Borderer:

Of laith, laith were our gude Scots lords
To weet their cork-heel'd shoon—
But lang or a' the play was played,
They wat their hats aboon!

His great luxury is Allan Ramsay's "Gentle Shepherd." He has it all by heart, and knows every pool, glen, bush, and cottage which Allan describes. I don't know how many copies and editions he possesses; yet, notwithstanding all this store, I never saw him evince more sparkling delight than lately, when one of the most gifted of Scotia's young artists presented him with some old rare edition of this same "Gentle Shepherd," illustrated by a superior style of engravings.

But it would be easy to add item after item to the fine peculiarities, and bright and witty sayings of Leigh Hunt, nor as time and opportunity give occasion, shall I, Timothy Quidnunc, fail to do this. For, as I would never abuse or betray the sacred confidence of any man's hearth or private conversation be he clown or man of genius—at the same time, I should feel it no dishonorable or ungracious employment, in a prudent, discreet manner, to picture to others who have not the opportunities, such a man "in his habit as he lives," and give circulation to his general sayings and experiences, which, without having any privacy in them, might, communicate a more distinct and vivid image of the great original. Beyond this I would not go.

I shall finish for the present with one most characteristic remark he made, and which I record, not so much for originality or profundity, as to give a specimen of the large tolerating disposition and sober-mindedness of the man. Happening to touch upon the inconsistencies sometimes observable in men generally good and exact, he said—"When I find a man sound and whole at a certain point where we meet, I do not busy myself with other points in which I am not concerned, which I only hear of by vague rumor, and which I have no direct means of seeing into. Nor am I surprised at inconsistencies. What surprises me is, how a rag of us can hang together. Look at parentage, early associates, accidents, myriads of things—how strange that the lump comes out so homogeneous as it is! Let us be thankful for the measure of consistency that is in man—not grumble about his inconsistencies. Poor humanity is like a crow's nest up a high tree in a windy day—how any of the sticks remain is the wonder, not that a few of them snap, or get into such a shape we don't know where they had been lying before. I have long noted down practical rules for life, as they came evidenced to my mind either from wise books, or the conversation of men of experience, or what had been forced upon me by my own convictions. One is simple, but carries me far—to put the best construction upon every human action, till a bad is proved, and to call that bad no worse that it is proved to be.—*Timothy Quidnunc, in the Dumfries and Galloway Courier.*

PERFECT FELICITY.

IN A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW.

I AM the Raven in the Happy family—and nobody knows what a life of misery I lead!

The dog informs me (he was a puppy about town before he joined us; which was lately) that there is more than one happy family on view in London. Mine, I beg to say, may be known by being the Family which contains a splendid raven.

I want to know why I am to be called upon to accommodate myself to a cat, a mouse, a pigeon, a ring-dove, an owl, (who is the greatest ass I have ever known,) a guinea-pig, a sparrow, and a variety of other creatures with whom I have no opinion in common. Is this national education? Because, if it is, I object to it. Is our cage what they call neutral ground, on which all parties may agree? If so, war to the beak I consider preferable.

What right has any man to require me to look complacently at a cat on a shelf all day? It may be all very well for the owl. My opinion of *him* is that he blinks and stares himself into a state of such dense stupidity that he has no idea of what company he is in. I have seen him, with my own eyes, blink himself, for hours, into the conviction that he was alone in a belfry. But *I* am not the owl. It would have been better for me, if I had been born in that station of life.

I am a Raven, I am, by nature, a sort of collector, or antiquarian. If I contributed, in my natural state, to any periodical, it would be The Gentleman's Magazine. I have a passion for amassing things that are of no use to me, and burying them. Supposing such a thing—I don't wish it to be known to our proprietor that I put this case, but I say, supposing such a thing—as that I took out of one of the Guinea-Pig's eyes; How could I bury it here? The floor of the cage is not an inch thick. To be sure I could dig through it with my bill (if I dared), but what would be the comfort of dropping a Guinea-Pig's eye into Regent street.

What *I* want is privacy. I want to make a collection. I desire to get a little property together.—How can I do it here? Mr. Hudson couldn't have done it, under corresponding circumstances.

I want to live by my own abilities, instead of being provided for in this way. I am stuck in a cage with these incongruous companions, and called a member of the Happy Family; but suppose you took a Queen's Counsel out of Westminster Hall, and settled him board and lodging free, in Utopia, where there would be no excuse for "his quidits, his quillets, his cases, his frames, and his tricks," how do you think *he'd* like it? Not at all. Then why do you expect *me* to like it, and add insult to injury by calling me a "Happy" Raven!

This is what *I* say: I want to see men do it. I should like to get up a Happy Family of men, and show 'em. I should like to put the Rajah Brooke, the Peace Society, Captain Aaron Smith, several Malay Pirates, Doctor Wiseman, the Rev. Hugh Stowell, Mr. Fox of Oldham, the Board of Health, all the London Undertakers, some of the Common (very common *I* think) Council, and all the vested interests in the filth and misery of the poor into a good sized cage, and see how *they'd* get on. I should like to look in at 'em through the bars, after they had undergone the training I have undergone. You wouldn't find Sir Peter Laurie "putting down" Sanitary-then, or getting up in *that* vestry and pledging his word and honor to the non-existence of St. Paul's Cathedral, I expect! And very happy *he'd* be, wouldn't he, when he couldn't do that sort of thing?

I have no idea of you lords of the creation coming staring at me in this false position. Why don't you look at home? If you think I'm fond of the dove, you're very much mistaken. If you imagine there is the least good will between me and the pigeon, you never were more deceived in your lives. If you suppose I wouldn't demolish the whole Family (myself excepted) and the cage too, if I had my own way, you don't know what a real Raven is. But if you *do* know this why am *I* to be picked out as a curiosity? Why don't you go and stare at the Bishop of Exeter? Ecod, he's one of our breed if any body is!

Do you make me lead this public life because I seem to be what I ain't? Why I don't make half the pretences that are common among you men!—You never heard *me* call the sparrow my noble friend. When did *I* ever tell the Guinea-Pig that he was my Christian brother? Name the occasion of my making myself a party to the "sham" (my friend Mr. Carlyle will lend me his favorite word for the occasion) that the cat hadn't really her eye upon the mouse! Can *you* say as much? What about the last Court Ball, the next Debate in the Lords, the last great Ecclesiastical Suit, the next long assembly in the Court Circular? I wonder you are not ashamed to look me in the eye! I am an independent member—of the Happy Family; and I ought to be let out.

I have only one consolation in my inability to damage anything, and that is that I hope I am instumental in propagating a delusion as to the character of Ravens. I have a strong impression that the sparrows on our beat are beginning to think that they may trust a Raven. Let 'em try! There's an uncle of mine, in a stable yard down in Yorkshire, who will very soon undeceive any small bird that may favor him with a call.

The dogs too. Ha! ha! As they go by they look at me and this dog in quite a friendly way.—They never suspect how I should hold on to the tip of his tail if I consulted my own feelings instead of our proprietor's. It's almost worth being here, to think of some confiding dog who has seen me, going too near a friend of mine who lives at a hackney-coach stand in Oxford Street. You wouldn't stop *his* squeaking in a hurry, if my friend got a chance at him.

It's the same with the children. There's a young gentleman with a hat and feathers, resident in Portland-place, who brings a penny to our proprietor twice a week. He wears very short white drawers and has mottled legs above his socks. He hasn't the least idea what I should do to his legs, if I consulted my own inclinations. He never imagines what I am thinking of when we are looking at one another.—May he only take those legs, in their present juicy state, close to the cage of my brother-in-law at the Zoological Gardens, Regent's Park!

Call yourselves rational beings and talk about our being reclaimed! Why, there isn't one of us who wouldn't astonish you if we could only get out!—Let *me* out and see whether I should be meek or not. But this is the way you always go on—you know you do. Up at Pentonville, the sparrow says—and he ought to know, for he was born in a stack of chimneys in the prison—you are spending I am afraid to say how much every year out of the rates to keep men in solitude, where they can't do any harm (that you know of), and then you sing all sorts of chorusses about their being good. So am I what you call good—here. Why? Because I can't help it. Try me outside!

You ought to be ashamed of yourselves, the Magpie says; and I agree with him. If you are determined to pet only those who take things and hide them, why don't you pet the Magpie and me? We are interesting enough for you, ain't we? The Mouse says you are not half so particular about the honest people. He is not a bad authority. He was almost starved when he lived in a workhouse, wasn't he? He didn't get much fatter, I suppose, when he moved to a laborer's cottage? He was thin enough when he came from that place, here—I know that. And what does the Mouse (whose word is his bond) declare? He declares that you don't take half the care you ought of your own young, and don't teach 'em half enough. Why don't you then? You might give your proprietor something to do, I should think, in twisting miserable boys and girls into their proper nature, instead of twisting us out of ours. You are a nice set of fellows, certainly, to come and look at Happy Families, as if you had nothing else to look after!

I take the opportunity of our proprietor's pen and ink in the evening to write this. I shall put it away in a corner—quite sure, as it's intended for the Post Office, of Mr. Rowland Hill's getting hold of it somehow, and sending it to somebody. I understand he can do anything with a letter. Though the owl says (but I don't believe him) that the present prevalence of measles and chicken-pox among infants in all parts of this country has been caused by Mr Rowland Hill. I hope I needn't add that we Ravens are all good-scholars, but that we keep our secret (as Indians believe the Monkeys do, according to a parrot of our acquaintance) lest our abilities should be imposed upon. As nothing worse than my present degradation as a member of the Happy Family can happen to me, however, I desert the General Freemasons' Lodge of Ravens, and express my disgust in writing.—*Household Words.*

From the British Friend.

ORIGINAL LETTER FROM SIR WALTER SCOTT,

RELATIVE TO HIS ANCESTRAL CONNECTION WITH THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE BRITISH FRIEND:—*Dear Friends,*—Having met with the following letter, I forward it for insertion in your columns, not doubting that it will be perused with interest by many of your readers. It was addressed to a Friend in the North, in answer to one he had written to Sir Walter Scott, inquiring if he had ever met with any writings or minute books belonging to their Monthly Meeting, among his family papers. W. L.

Leeds, 3d Month, 12th, 1850.

ABBOTSFORD, MELROSE, 1829.

SIR,—I received your letter yesterday, and lose no time in replying. I have particular family reasons for desiring to oblige the Society of Friends: as two of my ancestors—one by my mother's, and the other by my father's side—were members of that respectable body. They were both persons of some worldly distinction; the first was that John Swinton, of Swinton, whose talents were much used by Cromwell, in the administration of Scotland; and who narrowly escaped with life, after the Restoration. He is mentioned, I believe, in Cruize's *History*, and in most Scottish histories. He was a great-grandfather to my late mother; his papers, if he left any, must be with the Swintons, of Swinton.

My great-grandfather's father was Walter Scott, first laird of Raeburn, third son of Sir Walter Scott, of Harden, and proprietor of these lands about Lessudden, on which his descendant still resides: he suffered severely for his religious faith, being repeatedly thrown into prison by the orders of the privy council; and he himself, and his wife, Isabella Macdougal, daughter of Macdougal, of Makerston, separated by violence from their children. I could point out some curious memoranda of his sufferings, if it would further the objects of the meeting. My cousin, Mr. William Scott, younger, of Raeburn, is likely to know what papers of his survive; there is some correspondence, I know, besides what notices occur in the records of the privy council. I have a copy of a Pindarique poem on the death of this inoffensive and ill-used man, in which he is highly praised for his learning and talents. He was particularly skilful in the oriental languages; and, I believe, he and his immediate elder brother, Sir Gideon Scott, of High Chester, from whom the present Mr. Scott, of Harden, is descended, were proselytes to George Fox, when he visited Scotland. The then head of the family continued a staunch Presbyterian, and it was at his instance that Walter of Raeburn was so ill-treated.

If any notices of such meetings as you inquire after are still in existence, they must be at the house of Lessudden; and, as I said before, my cousin, William Scott, now younger, of Raeburn, will, I am sure, give you access to them; as, though neither he nor I have retained the peculiar tenets of the Friends, we are happy to acknowledge ourselves the descendants of one who suffered much for conscience sake.

I have seen, in my cousin's hands, some of the religious discourses of Walter Scott, first laird of Raeburn, which seemed to go deep into the disputed points betwixt the Society and the Church. I never observed any minutes among any such papers as have come under my observation.

If these particulars are of little consequence to the purport of your inquiries, they will at least serve to show my kind feelings towards the Society, in which I have possessed some valued friends, now removed in addition to my claim of ancestral connection.

I am, sir, with respect, your friend and well-wisher. WALTER SCOTT.

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO IN AFRICA?

THE chimerical attempt to blockade the coast of Africa, after incalculable waste of human life, and the expenditure of more millions of sterling treasure than would suffice to build, float, and man all the navies of the world, has been proved and proclaimed a complete failure. But the experience yielded by this costly and fruitless experiment has, we fear, only supplied a fresh incentive to the pertinacity of the Foreign Minister. Lord PALMERSTON has, it appears, been conducting a negotiation with the Danish government for the transference to this country of some additional territory on the west coast of Africa. The correspondence has just been published, and from its contents it would appear that nothing now remains to complete the negotiation but a parliamentary vote for the purchase money. The territory in question lies on the Gold Coast, as it is called, of Africa, and extends about 150 miles in length, and occupies a considerable stretch of country inland, the boundaries of which are altogether doubtful and undefined. Now, we think it necessary to warn the public against any further extension of territory in this direction. Whatever may be the pretences put forth to justify the acquisition, we have the strongest conviction that it is merely the prelude to some new scheme for additional armaments and costly establishments in that quarter. No doubt we shall hear a good deal about the recent success of the Government in forming treaties with the native African chiefs for the suppression of Slavery, and the importance of securing so favorable a position for extending the influences of legitimate commerce and Christianity. Let it be remembered that we have already four or five settlements upon the same line of coast—that the climate is most pestiferous and deadly—that we have made several purchases of the same kind within the last thirty years, and that not the slightest progress has been made towards any one of the objects which have been the pretended inducements to this policy. In 1816, we purchased from the King of COMBO the island of St. Mary, at the mouth of the Gambia. This island is a mere sand bank, and the resident Europeans do not number 60 persons. Now, what is the cost of this settlement?—Why, for its civil government alone this country pays nearly £5,000 a year, whilst an additional £7,000 is raised by taxes upon commerce to defray the remaining expenses of the different establishments. And this does not include any portion of the cost of the milltary or naval force maintained for the assumed protection of the settlements.

Then, a little lower down the coast, we have the settlement of Sierra Leone—the grave of Europeans. This colony was established in 1791. By the evidence of Dr. MADDEN, who visited Sierra Leone as a government commissioner, in 1840, and other witnesses examined before a parliamentary committee that sat in 1842, the cost of the various establishments, civil and military, with the charges of the mixed commission courts, and the expenses entailed by the liberated Africans, is estimated at no less than £100,000 a year. The cost of the court of justice alone amounts to £2,000 a year; whilst by the testimony of a resident Queen's advocate, Mr. PINE, it appears that during the seven years he officiated in that court, he could not remember more than five or six cases which were brought before it for trial. The climate is so pestiferous, that even native Africans cannot maintain their numbers under its deadly influence. Children born of white parents invariably die, and although the settlement has been in our possession for 60 years, there are not more than 80 Europeans resident upon it.

Along the gold coast, we have already four settlements, Cape Coast Castle, Accra, Dix Cone, and Annamaboe. These settlements are simply forts; the country around them, and even in their immediate vicinity, is described as—"a wilderness, an impenetrable jungle where cultivation has never been." Now, it is along this coast and adjoining these settlements that the Danish territory lies which Lord PALMERSTON has already agreed to purchase. There are five forts, and with all the stores, guns, and appurtenances thereto belonging, the Danish Government is eager to hand them over to this country for the paltry sum of £10,000. A cheap bargain, we shall be told, no doubt. But what will be the cost of the garrisons we shall send, the governors we shall appoint, and all the official apparatus for adequately representing the imperial authority of Great Britain? Why are the Danes so eager to close this bargain, and get rid of their colonies, as encumbrances, at any price? And what has been the result of all our past efforts at compulsory civilization? The official correspondence between the naval commanders of the coast blockade and Lord PALMERSTON, clearly establishes the fact that, although we have bribed and pensioned the native chiefs in all directions to sign treaties of commerce, repudiating the slave trade, and binding them to expel all Europeans from their territories who are not authorized by the British functionaries to conduct a *legitimate* commerce, the slave trade still goes on, and our attempts at coercion only alienate and exasperate these petty, but adroit, and even diplomatic savages.

Now, is Lord PALMERSTON about to transfer the blockade from the sea to the land? And is the purchase of these Danish forts to be the first step towards an armed intervention for the enforcement of pretended treaties, which, in the correspondence already published, several of the native chiefs allege to have been compulsorily and not voluntarily signed? We confess, we look with suspicion at the possible results foreshadowed by this proposed extension of our territory on the West Coast of Africa. We see in it the germs of a policy that may stealthily involve us in consequences from which it would be difficult hereafter to recede. Our career of Indian conquest commenced under precisely similar pretences, and though the tropical fastnesses of Africa would prove an impenetrable barrier to confirmed empire in that direction, it by no means follows that under shelter of a sounding philanthropy we may not be committed, by slow stages, to a most costly and unjustifiable waste of human life and treasure. We want *a new remedy* for the Slave Trade, and Lord PALMERSTON is just the man to hit upon a captivating scheme that, like the coast blockade, shall begin with a squadron, and end with a fleet. When Sir THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, in 1840, laid bare the sacrifices and inhumanity of this coast blockade, the failure was as fully proved, and the impossibility of future success as certainly demonstrated as by the evidence submitted to the two committees of the Lords and Commons in 1848 and 1849. But did Lord PALMERSTON admit the failure? No; it supplied the argument for additional armaments and increased expenditure! The blockade was reinforced, and we have spent millions of money since that time, and sacrificed numbers of valuable lives, in merely adding an accumulation of similar evidence to the pre-existing proofs. And now we are to have a long line of inland forts, stretching from the mouths of the Gambia to those of the Niger—recommencing, in all probability, as fatal a series of disaster and failure by land, as we have already thrown away thirty millions of good hard cash upon, by sea.

This negotiation with Denmark for the purchase of her settlements, is the first stealthy committal of the Government to all the after consequences. It should be resisted at the outset. The sanction of Parliament is needed for the completion of the contract. We are glad to see that Mr. COBDEN has given notice of his intention to oppose in Parliament a grant of the purchase money. Let the Government once gain possession of these forts, and instantly a new batch of governors, with a costly staff of civil and military functionaries will be required. Will the Financial Reformers of Manchester and Liverpool remain passive after all their public protests against our costly and oppressive colonial establishments? They should strengthen the hands of Mr. COBDEN by energetic petitions against any further attempts to extend our territory in tropical regions. Whatever may be the ultimate aims or immediate policy of Lord PALMERSTON, the facts before the public justify the strongest suspicion, that these Danish forts are meant to subserve some cunning contrivance for again committing this country to a renewal, under another form, of some scheme for crushing the Slave Trade, quite as impracticable and quite as costly as the African Coast Blockade. —*Manchester Examiner and Times.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

THE *Liverpool Albion* tells a *bon mot* which created a good deal of laughter. "On Friday, in the Crown Court, before Mr. Baron Alderson, a juryman, on the oath being administered, addressing the clerk, said, 'Speak up! I cannot hear what you say.' Baron Alderson: 'Stop! are you deaf?' Jury: 'Yes, of one ear.' Judge: 'Then you had better leave that box for it is necessary that juryman should *hear both sides.*'"

——EARLY RISING EXTRAORDINARY.—At the Marlborough street police court, last week, two persons were brought up for having practised imposition on the Duke of Wellington. To take in his grace—if there is any truth in proverbs—they must have got up, as Samuel Peppys says. "mighty betimes,".—*Punch*

——A writer in *Notes and Queries* says, "The Maltese at Valetta, on Good Friday Eve, have the custom of *jangling* the church bells with the utmost violence, in execration of the memory of Judas; and I have seen there a large wooden machine (of which they have many in use), constructed on a principle similar to that of an old-fashioned watchman's rattle, but of far greater power in creating an uproar, intended to be symbolical of the rattling of *Judas's bones, that will not rest in his grave.*"

——The *Literary Gazette* justly remarks, "The newspapers at the present time are of a shocking nature. What with the superabundant and minute details of facetious breaches of marriage promises, the obscene particulars of gross seductions, and the brutal horrors of atrocious murders, they look as if they represented a condition of society too monstrous even for barbarism, and too contaminating for the continued existence of civilization."

——At the Lord Mayor's dinner, on Monday, the American minister, in replying to a toast, said:—"There was a custom at that table of pledging each other in the loving cup; he had sipped of that loving cup; and, by doing so, had pledged himself on behalf of the 22,000,000 American people whom he represented, to maintain relations of brotherhood with his country."

[22,000,000! That would include the "niggers." Surely Mr. Abbott Lawrence wouldn't demean himself to maintain relations of brotherhood with them? Won't Wm. Wells Brown call upon him and ask the question?]

——A HINT FOR THE PUBLISHERS.—As the publishing season will soon be in full play—which means that there will be plenty of work—we suggest the following as titles of books, to succeed the publication of "People I have Met," by an American:—

"People I have Taken into Custody," by a Policeman.
"People that have Met me Half-way," by an Insolvent.
"People I have Solashed," by a Scavenger.
"People I have done," by a Jew Bill-Discounter.
"People I have Abused," by a 'Bus Conductor.
"People I have Run Over," by a Butcher's Boy.
"People I have Run Against," by a Sweep.—*Punch.*

——THE WORLD'S "MULTUM IN PARVO."—We are told that a company is on foot for the purpose of buying up Lord Brougham. The object of the purchase is to send in the honorable lord at the forthcoming Exhibition of 1851. With his lordship the company feels sure of winning the great prize, as there is scarcely a thing that he does not know something of; and if they can only keep him from talking, they feel persuaded they can palm him off as the most wonderful specimen of British industry. We are sorely afraid, however, that the company, let it have the wealth of California added even to that of Monte-Christo, must be ruined, if it is compelled to take Lord Brougham at his own valuation.—*Punch.*

——A JEWISH MARTYR.—It is our painful duty to record a case of martyrdom which but recently occurred in the Empire of Morocco. We give the awful details from a private letter which we have seen, received by Mr. Abraham Sebag, a respectable Jewish merchant, residing in Castle-street, St. Mary Axe, London, whose brother has fallen a victim to the barbarity of the inhabitants of that uncivilized country. It appears that Judah Sebag, a Jewish merchant, who resided in a town called Alig, near Mogador, was maliciously accused of having spoken blasphemy against the Mohammedan faith. The cause of this malice was the jealousy of some Mohammedan merchants. He was dragged before the governor, or, rather, the chief magistrate of the city, whose name is Lechusman ben Hassam. The evidence against him having been heard, the sentence of the judge was, that he either must embrace Mohammedanism, or be burned to death. Judah Sebag indignantly refused to deny his religion, and nobly chose the alternative—death. The governor immediately ordered a large fire to be made, into which the man was thrown, and soon devoured by the flames. He was but twenty-four years of age. The letter concludes with the following words of consolation:—"He died for the glory and sanctification of his faith and his God, and may his soul be bound up in the bundle of life!"—*Jewish Chronicle.*

——CHOOSING THEIR MINISTER.—A London Correspondent of the *Edinburgh News*, says, "Dr. Candlish for the last two Sabbaths has almost restored Regent Square Church to the fame it used to enjoy in Edward Irving's best days. The attendance at least was so great as to remind one of that period. On the first day of his preaching he was visited by some of our great men; amongst others were the Duke of Argyle, Sir James Graham, Mr. Carlyle, Lord Roden, and Lord John Russell, with some members of the Ministry. There is a story to account for *their* attendance, which I will venture to repeat, though you may have heard it. Most of her Majesty's Ministers, it would seem, attend Whitehall Chapel, where the Rev. Mr. Sewell is the officiating clergyman; it further appears that he happens to differ from the Ministry on the subject of national education, and it got wind that he meant in his discourse on the Sunday in question to show up the Ministers in regard to their conduct on the education scheme, drawing a parallel—not very complimentary—betwixt their character and that of Pontius Pilate. Rather than face this, they went off in a body to hear the great gun of the Free Church. Here, moreover, they did not altogether escape Scot-free, as some of the Rev. doctor's remarks were pretty heavy back-handed hits on their proceedings. It is said that the minister at Whitehall, missing his intended victims, did not give his illustration."

——EBENEZER ELLIOTT ON PUBLIC LECTURES.—Mr. Lister of Sheffield, an intimate friend of the late Ebenezer Elliott, read the following letter from the poet, after a recent lecture in that town: "Dear sir, I told Mrs. E., when I read the sketch of your lecture, that you could not do the subject justice in less than six orations. Always send your audience away full, yet hungry, rather than tired and wanting. No lecture should exceed three quarters of an hour in its delivery. Speak slowly and clearly, standing bolt upright, seldom moving your hands, and scarcely ever bending your body. Nothing is worse in a speaker's manner than cucking like a barber; but dropping the voice at the end of a sentence is a still worse fault. Be stiff necked, too, but without insolently throwing the head back; for if you cannot speak with calm power, as one having authority, what right have you to speak at all? Use very few long sentences. Interpose round shot (short ones) for emphasis; also for safety. You may want time to breathe. The best test of a good lecture is a select audience, but it tries the lecturer. Hostile interruption is better than none; and the best school for a lecturer is the controversial platform, with an unwelcome subject. Elocutionists will say, not too much of this; but what do they know of the business? If you extemporize, you might, as a Quaker, use the Quaker's privilege, (as Emerson does,) in the occasional dignity of silence.—*Ebenezer Elliott.*

——"THE HORRORS ON BOARD THE SLAVE SHIPS" (says a correspondent of a London paper) "have been almost equalled by a case which has occurred at Youghal. The schooner Star of the Sea, of Kinsale, from Clonakilty to Cardiff, had put into Youghal for safety (being unseaworthy,) with a crowd of both sexes, young and old (205 souls in all), on board. She had been four days out, and during that time the condition of the unfortunate passengers was awful in the extreme. They were without food and almost naked, and had had nothing to lie down on but the ballast in the hold, whereon they had managed to huddle together. 145 of the poor creatures were at once admitted into the workhouse by the Youghal authorities."

——INEDITED LINES BY ROBERT BURNS.—We (*London News*) find the following communication from the Rev. J. Reynell Wreford, in *Notes and Queries*, a journal which promises to be of great assistance to literary men. The following lines by Robert Burns have never appeared in any collection of his works. They were given to me some time ago at Chatham Barracks, by Lieutenant-Colonel Fergusson, R. N., formerly of Dumfriesshire, by whom they were copied from the *tumbler* upon which they were originally written. Shortly before the death of Alan Cunningham I sent these verses to him, as well as two epigrams of Burns, "On Howlet Face," and "On the Mayor of Carlisle's impounding his Horse," which were not included in his edition of Burns' works. In a letter which I received from Alan Cunningham, and which now lies before me, he says:—"The pieces you were so good as